Linguistic and Cultural Aspects

of

the Russian Postmodern Novel and its Translation:

Кысь

by

Tatyana Tolstaya

Presented by

Lynne Craig Knowles

for the Degree of

M.Litt.

The University of Edinburgh

2007

CONTENTS

Introduction

This dissertation, entitled *Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of the Russian Postmodernist Novel and its Translation: Tatyana Tolstaya's* 'Кысь', is in five chapters, of which the first relates primarily to themes of the Russian source text. The translation in question is by the American Jamey Gambrell, and inevitably it is referred to in Chapter 1, although Chapter 2 offers an overview of the translation theory against which the translation is assessed. Chapters 3 and 4 cover the translation of language and meaning respectively. The fifth chapter introduces a French-language translation to compare two translations operating under two different sets of norms. I conclude by proposing a format for a translation that could make the novel more accessible to a non-Russian readership.

In this Introduction, brief biographical details of Tatyana Tolstaya and a synopsis of the novel *Кысь* are followed by extracts of interviews conducted with Tolstaya over the last 20 years. As the dissertation will show, the novel has aroused no little conflict of opinion and it is appropriate that the author puts her side of the story first.

Many of the texts quoted in the following are only available in Russian and my translations are attributed by 'trans. LCK'. In the sections dealing with the technicalities of translation, I have given page numbers using the shortened notation (R: -) to refer to the source text (Tolstaya 2000) and (E: -) to refer to the English translation (Tolstaya 2003a).

Where I have transliterated from Russian into English, I have followed the Library of Congress system except where alternative English equivalents have become well established. For example, I will refer to the name of the author at the heart of this dissertation, *Татьяна Толстая* (officially transliterated 'Tat'iana Tolstaia') as 'Tatyana Tolstaya', in line with common usage.

The novel *Кысь* is generally acknowledged to be a demanding book and it is a tribute to its complexity that this dissertation cannot possibly hope to cover all the issues explored by the author. I have, however, endeavoured to analyse some themes

and certain passages in considerable detail, and have been struck by the skill and perseverance of the two existing translations of this novel. Comments offered here are not to be taken as criticism but are offered as alternative approaches to attempt to meet those challenges posed by the source text.

Tatyana Nikitinichna Tolstaya (born Leningrad, 3 May 1951)

Tatyana Tolstaya is one of seven siblings born in Leningrad of a highly literary family. She is the great grand-niece of Lev Tolstoy and granddaughter of the author Aleksey Nikolaevich Tolstoy (whose mother, Aleksandra Turgeneva was also a writer) and the poetess Natalia Vasil'evna Krandievskaia. Her grandfather on her mother's side was the well-known literary translator, Mikhail Leonidovich Lozinskii. Tatyana was named after Lozinskii's wife, Tatiana Borisovna Lozinskaia who committed suicide when Mikhail Leonidovich died in 1955. The latter's influence on the family was evidently profound as Tolstaya recalls in her essay *Переводные картинки* (Transfers) (Tolstaya 2003c: 245-275, trans. LCK):

> My grandfather Mikhail Leonidovich Lozinskii was a great translator with six languages at his fluent command who translated into Russian, in addition to much else, 'Hamlet' and 'The Divine Comedy'. I don't remember him – he died when I was four, a bitter sorrow in my life. But in our house it was as if he were alive and we talked about him every day, such that he would practically sit down with us at the table, or having noiselessly pushed back his chair, he would get up and go off into his study – to work – like an invisible shadow (ibid: 250).

In the same essay Tolstaya recollects how, according to her parents, she started reading at the age of three – 'I read everything in rapid succession. I was taught my first foreign language at five, English to start with then French, and after that, unsuccessfully, German' (ibid: 247) Tolstaya tells us little of her mother, other than of the latter's great displeasure at her reading copious amounts of Agatha Christie books in both languages – 'she taking the view that we should read Shakespeare and such like' (ibid.) and that she also spoke three languages. She makes frequent reference instead to her father, a physicist and linguist, who would read aloud to the children, 'sometimes with tears in his eyes […] often repeating the same line twice and three times and over and over again: then the first time you are hearing the idea,

the second time the sound, and on the third you begin to see the bronzed lustre of the words, their hard outlines' (ibid: 249):

> On a Sunday morning there would be my father walking around the flat in cheerful mood, waving his hand with its eternal cigarette, and on his face a blissful delight in the sounds, the peal they make, their rhythm, their resonance, in all of that which lies under the word, behind the word, in all of that which the word brings with it – its footprint, its rustle, its light and its lustre – all wheeled out on parade in celebration (ibid: 251).

Her father, too, spoke three languages and is credited by her with teaching her two.

After studying classics at Leningrad University[1], where she reports acerbically that students were told by the university authorities 'not to get too carried away with with this Ancient Greek of yours. You'll be left without a job all the same. Look, you've got some Russian and German in the course - that's good. That will get you a living.'[2] Tolstaya married Andrei Lebedev in 1974 and has two sons. Her elder son, Artemii Lebedev, is currently a well-known and successful web-designer who also produced the artwork for the covers of Tolstaya's series of books *Кысь* (2000), *День* (2001), *Двое* (2002), *Изюм* (2002), *Ночь* (2003), *Круг* (2003), *Не Кысь* (2005) and *Кысь* (reprinted 2005).

Tolstaya left Russia for nearly ten years, from 1989 to 1998, to live in the USA. On her return to Russia she completed *Кысь*, a novel she had begun back in 1986. She now splits her time between Russia and the US.

[1] see also her 1988 interview in *Неделя*, where Tolstaya recounts with much affection the tale of her 'wonderful' old university professor in Greek, Aristid Ivanovich Dovatur, a survivor of the camps who spent his whole life studying Herodotus and used his own money to buy expensive Greek books for the students but was forced by the authorities to retire, despite offering to teach without payment (Mal'gin 1988). It is interesting to suppose whether this professor was the real-life model for Nikita Ivanovich in *Кысь*.

[2] (ibid. trans. LCK)

Кысь: Book Synopsis

The narrative is set in Moscow a few hundred years after an 'explosion', the city now being named after its dictator, Fedor Kuz'mich. The characters in the novel are divided into three main groups: the first are the Former Ones who managed to survive the explosion and, barring accidents, continue to go on living, still holding memories of their distant past. The second group, the majority, is composed of individuals born after the disaster: these individuals have an assortment of unusual physical attributes, e.g. some have tails, others claws etc. The third group are half human, half animal and serve as slaves. The title of the novel refers to a mythological animal of great power which lives in the vicinity of the town and attacks any individual who appears in sight.

The hero of the narrative, Benedikt, has a tail and is one of those born after the disaster. His job is to copy out the only books permitted, these written by Fedor Kuz'mich, who is in fact plagiarizing everything from some of the old books in his possession. A fellow worker is Olen'ka, daughter of Kudeiar Kudeiarich, the so-called 'Chief Saniturian' and watchman over the ideological purity of the people: his work involves vigorously enforcing the ban on unofficial books. Benedikt and Olen'ka eventually get married, but not before Nikita Ivanovich, a 'Former One' born before the explosion, tries to instil some pre-Explosion values in Benedikt, encouraging him to carve a wooden statue of Pushkin, and amputating his tail in preparation for his wedding. Benedikt discovers that his father-in-law has a library of pre-Explosion books; after reading them all without understanding most of them, Benedikt becomes desperate for more, and sets out on a murderous campaign to search out illicitly held books. Father-in-law incites Benedikt to join him in a successful revolution to abolish the rule of Fedor Kuz'mich. Kudeiarich assumes power in the name of democracy, but becomes an autocratic tyrannical dictator, naming the town after himself. For allegedly spreading ideas of which he does not approve, Kudeiarich orders that Nikita Ivanovich be burnt at the stake. Kudeiarich has managed to get hold of some petrol but the fire blazes violently out of control and consumes almost the entire town. Miraculously, Nikita Ivanovich, Benedikt and another Former One survive. The book ends with the two old men joining hands and soaring away, leaving Benedikt's questions unanswered.

Interviews with Tatyana Tolstaya about *Кысь*

In an interview in 2000 with the magazine *Афиша* (Afisha), published under the title *Непальцы и Мюмзики* (The Nepalese and the Miumziki) (Tolstaya and Tolstaya 2002 trans. LCK), Tolstaya discloses that the word *Кысь* exists in the language of the Komi people, although she professes not to know what it means. The interview proceeds:

> Did you take the idea for the book from that?
>
> No. It just happened that a long time ago my husband and I - he's a linguist, like me – were sitting playing a light-hearted game with poetry. If you recall, in one of the translations of *Alice in Wonderland* there are these verses: "…and the pests grunted like pigs in the trough". The discussion about whether the use of *мат*[1] is allowed in print is over. In my text there are three items of informal expressions. We get the impression that this world is populated not so much by people as by […] mutilated words. And that is precisely the consequence of the catastrophe depicted in the novel. The mutilation of language (ibid: 336).

In an earlier interview for her book *Voices of Russian Literature* (Laird 1999), Sally Laird had asked Tolstaya her opinion on the employment of sex and obscenities in literature:

> After glasnost they started all these new styles. Aha, they said, there's no tradition of eroticism in Russian literature, let's create one! But all the results were in very poor taste […] a writer plays with words and meanings; the activity of writing as such is purely spiritual. These writers (Viktor Yerofeyev, Vladimir Sorokin, Valeriya Narbikova) are trying to pull it down from its pedestal. So they stuff their texts with all kinds of bodily functions – but they score an own goal, because it just doesn't work […] if the reader is simply repelled then it hasn't worked (ibid: 115).

In passing it is worth noting that the critics did not claim to be repelled by the obscenities in *Кысь*, although it was remarked that some American admirers of Tolstaya's earlier short stories might be in for a disappointment. The treatment of

[1] vulgar swear words

vulgarities in translation will be commented upon at various points throughout the dissertation.

As well as the swear words, *Кысь* features 'rustic' language: in an interview with *Московские новости*, reproduced as *Мюмзики и Нострадамус* (Miumziki and Nostradamus) Tolstaya was asked whether she was also indebted to her nursemaid for the 'rustic' language of the novel?

> Partly. That is a live source, but there are literary ones too – Platonov, for example. Dahl. By the way there are few invented words in the novel – a dozen, probably, but a lot is taken from Dahl. There are fascinating sayings there: "Strike a Russian and he will make the hours" (it would be good to hang a poster like that on Watch Factory No 2). "The bear lives without having a wash". The greeting: "How's your thieving going?" A lot, an awful lot there is offensive and politically incorrect about different nations. But it's easy to pick up vocabulary. More difficult is the syntax and morphology – it isn't an entirely literary language, pre-Pushkin, pre-Petrine in part, strewn with particles, old verb forms. There is a form like он ушедцы (on ushedtsy), that is он уже ушел (on uzhe ushel), он есть ушедший (on est' ushedshii)[1]. I'm used to it from childhood, from my nursemaid. But for someone who hasn't heard it, it will be incomprehensible of course. My nursemaid came from the village of Plyuss, that's between Luga and Pskov. I hope that they speak so beautifully there even today […] at first I meant just to give the chapter headings a number, but it seemed boring. What does that mean – Chapter 28? Then I decided that once the novel was in book form, then we would make a book of it. Having spread out these letters I had already written 75% of the text when I discovered that their "names", *az*, or *glagol*, or *pokoi*, somehow or other - not entirely but noticeably - were reflected in the text of the chapter. There is a mysticism about their image … (Tolstaya and Tolstaya 2002 trans. LCK: 342).

In an earlier interview with the *South Central Review* (Rich 1995), the topic was Russian literature after Perestroika. The interviewer reminded Tolstaya that in a previous 1988 conversation she had said that Russian literature was in a transitional stage. Did she still think that it was in this state of flux?

[1] All ways of saying 'he's gone away'.

> Yes, yes, but I see things differently from how I saw them five or six years ago […] the new texts appearing now are not as good as they used to be, […] the writers whom we know write worse than they used to […] for many people the decline of literature signifies the end of literature. They are especially sure they are right when they look at the new writers. They don't see anything interesting appearing because they make some level of comparison in their mind. I think it may be true, but it does not mean the end of literature, especially in Russia. Perhaps the older generation of writers does not have much to say because they have passed their acme […] those who are published now, those that you see, are not the best. Those who are the best may appear any time, in five year, in ten years, which of course does not signify any end to Russian literature.
> There will be very interesting writers. There were lots of ways of writing that were interrupted in Russia, underdeveloped, and so there is great potential in Russian literature (ibid: 85).

The interviewer said that it seemed to her that there was a reaction to serious literature, the kind of literature that inundated the market before perestroika, and that Russian publishers were trying to fill the vacuum with *razvlekatel'naia literatura*, entertaining literature, drawing this response:

> You know, I do not contrast serious literature with commercial literature, though they can be contrasted […] rather I would say that there is good literature and bad literature. Serious literature is ninety per cent bad and boring. Commercial literature is ninety-nine per cent bad. It is not boring, just bad.
> (ibid: 87).

In an interview with the Russian Language Journal (Barta, 1990 trans. LCK), Tolstaya was asked what made her start writing?

> I simply decided – right, now I can write. One of my impulses was the wish to create some kind of text in the real Russian language and not in the one in which those pieces ending up in print were written. The fact of the matter is that when you don't use some organ then it fades and dies. The danger that our genuine, rich Russian language will start to turn into a certain atavism was being very keenly felt at that time (the beginning of the 80s). Any words which seemed strange or jarred the ear of the official literary functionaries seemed to lose the right to exist and were banished from the realms of literature. I often think that if someone took it upon themselves to count up the word

> stock of a Soviet published author before 1983 then they would themselves get a shock, because that word stock would fit into a tiny little dictionary. Synonyms have completely fallen away. The representation of different layers of language has ceased to exist. Academician Lev Shcherba singled out four language strata: the elevated stratum, the neutral stratum, the familiar stratum and finally the vulgar stratum […] good writers work at certain levels of switching from one stratum to the other, and on the creation of diverse strata. This ability to combine – it completely died out with the average Soviet writer towards the middle of the 80s. I am of course speaking only about official, accessible literature, namely because the pressure of official literary functionaries partly consists of harrying someone into the neutral stratum; they take away the author's right to the familiar, vulgar and elevated strata (ibid: 267).

The perennial subject of soul, and in particular the 'Russian Soul', drew several responses from Tolstaya. This first is in response to a question about *Кысь* being full of verse – from Pushkin to Grebenshchikov. Did she compose any of them herself?

> No there are no made-up verses. Everything there is definitely quoted. Maybe you know Pushkin, Grebenshchikov, but you could scarcely know all the authors and indeed that is quite unnecessary. That is my personal span or reading, a little portion of it, a vague outline of the soul, more truthfully one of your souls – because of course people don't just have one soul, but several – for example the ancient Egyptians believed that there were two of them – *ba* and *ka*. And your favourite verses exhibit so to speak the traces of one of these souls. What to compare it with? At the end of the Wells novel, the Invisible Man runs unseen along the street under the autumn rain of London. A crowd is chasing him. And rivulets of rain, having fallen on his invisible surface, expose him, meaning he is handed over to his pursuers. And they set upon this watery silhouette, battering this invisible creature to death (Tolstaya and Tolstaya 2002 trans. LCK: 341).

An earlier comment comes from a 1992 interview with Publishers Weekly (Mestrovic 1992):

> The Russian soul – if it exists, then I dislike it. The Russian intelligentsia has a split mind about the matter. On the one hand, the intelligentsia belongs to the common people, who literally created this 'soul'; on the other, the intelligentsia has a logical ability that the common people do not have. The Russian soul is based on intuition, emotions, instincts – often very

> negative instincts. I am afraid of them – these common people with their collective soul. They can be generous, they can be greedy. They can be very courageous, but they can be traitors, too. They created the myth that they are more pure than we are, unspoiled by civilisation. This myth helped the Revolution to happen, giving those nice, pure, innocent people a certain license. They could do whatever they wanted. As a result of the Revolution, the most outstanding and the most beautiful were eliminated from society (ibid.).

Asked in 1990 about the influence of the intelligentsia, Tolstaya responded:

> Intellectuals are those who deal with some intellectual activity. Intelligentsia are people with a sophisticated soul, so to speak. That's the Russian difference: those people who feel responsibility for the others, themselves or society, for the environment, life, for the future and so on […] they were killed by the hundreds and thousands and millions … For me the intelligentsia was the flower of the nation. The only group who could lead the country somewhere and not let it become just a crowd of crazy people, not knowing where to go and what to do (Davies 1990: 28).

In the same year she spoke of the role of logic in Russian culture:

> Tradition has had the effect that logic in our country occupies second place. The Russian person reacts more immediately to emotional premises than to rational ones. Contempt for the work of logic, of the brain is a wondrous, unpleasant feature of part of Russian culture, but, in a striking way, as any strong spiritual movement, it has its rewards. Those rewards are not at all practical, the fruits of an exclusively spiritual sphere, but in them there is a peculiar charm and peculiar taste. "Logic is the devil," "logic is evil," and so on (Barta 1990 trans.LCK: 268-269).

Following publication of *Кысь*, an interviewer offered a provocative opinion that the main protagonist, Benedikt, a man of the people, had been endowed with the native Russian intellectual trait – a readiness to betray.

> Yes that is a common human trait. The man of the people is no better and no worse than the intellectual in that sense [...] I am on the side of the intellectuals, for one simple reason. The intellectual is by definition someone who has realised something, and the people – they are people who have not realised. The intellectual is someone who doesn't just want good things for himself personally – but the people want things

> for themselves personally (Tolstaya and Tolstaya 2002 trans. LCK: 349).

The subject of time – the past, the present, the future – has been a frequent source of comment by Tolstaya. Asked whether *Кысь* shows our future, she responded:

> No - our eternal present. It is true to say that when you write an anti-utopian novel it is almost inevitably seen as a political satire, but that wasn't what I really wanted. I wanted to write about life and about the people. About the enigmatic Russian people. This is a secret purer than the pyramids of Cheops, whether you are an ordinary peasant or the powers-that-be, it makes no difference (ibid: 344).

In 1990 she was asked what she thought was the best time for Russia:

> For us, the best time is always yesterday. There is in Russia a mistrust of pure logical thought which is believed to result in cold, heartless actions, and a corresponding veneration for feelings – for tears and weeping and warmth of emotion. These ideas are melted into the Russian soul and this water spoils the natural life, for it creates a passivity, a fatalism, and worse. Or we go to extremes. There are saints among our people too. Russia produces either criminals or saints, but not average, ordinary people. All my life I was a passionate reader, and from this I saw that in spite of communism, nothing had really changed since the 19th century. Russia remained Russia, only on a worse level. People then suffered, drank, wept, committed suicide … they felt just as we do. To me the 'social clothes' of what was happening under Communism became less and less important. The feeling for nostalgia is a basic thing for me. I have always thought that something truly worthwhile and admirable was destroyed by the revolution 70 years ago, and no one has known that kind of life since, except through their grandparents talk, and, of course, through books (Lambert 1990).

In another interview she was asked whether we have to consider memories of the past as being more real than the vague and foggy present:

> Yes, I think so. In any case I always had that attitude and it is part of my Zeitgeist, so to speak. There is no future, the present is only a mathematical line, the only reality is the past. Because that which was in the past, if you just look for it, nevertheless was. In the past there are always some solid things, and they

> remain in your memory. Memories of the past form a visible and tangible line (Roll 1990 trans. LCK: 149).

Tolstaya's contempt for the dogma of communism and the authorities' treatment of books, both themes of *Кысь*, are portrayed in these anecdotes from a 1988 interview:

> [In LGU[1]] there was no aesthetics, no Marxism, only dogmatism and ignorant dogmatism at that. Our lecturer declaimed:
>
> "Man **are** a social animal!" He raises his finger and waits a second. So that it sinks in. *Are* is third person plural. Someone from the hall: it's *is*. Down goes the finger. From the podium – 'What is?' - 'It's not *are*, it's *is*' - 'I don't understand' - 'Man *is*, not *are*'. 'What do you know!'
>
> And the library had its own tribulations: they chuck out 'unnecessary' books. Rareties, 18th century, simply because they are rarely requested editions. Everything – into storage. And the storage is in the basement of the Smolensky Institute. There the water is ankle-deep and rats running around. (Mal'gin 1988 trans. LCK)

In an interview with Serafima Roll (1996 trans. LCK) Tolstaya expounded at length when asked why her writing contained nothing heroic or optimistic, no emotional relationship with existence:

> I think that on the one hand this is a question of my individual perception of life, and on the other a question of time. There are ages when people on the whole, no matter how amazing this may seem, have a spirited attitude towards life and have belief in the fact that ahead lies something better. This is the message from such books as 'It's time to go ahead' and other things. Such times occur periodically in Russia. Everyone suddenly, like madmen, starts to believe that ahead of them lies something good. But I wasn't around at such a time – around me there were no people who believed in something or other and there was no reformatory spirit around me. On the contrary, there was basically a scepticism, because, thank God, we were all old hands at history and knew that there wasn't going to be anything

[1] Leningrad State University

> good, that everything would go its own set course. In part, it's possible that this pessimistic view of life is connected to a fixed Russian mentality. In Russia people are afraid to appear like emotional idiots and that's why they don't like hoping for something good in the future. Once you start thinking that in time everything will become better, that's when life will deal you a harsh blow. That's why, lest they put a jinx on some kind of interim feeling of happiness, they try not to mention it, as it were. A Russian person will reply to you with a 'Not bad' when asked 'How's things?' To an American person that's strange, for he cannot but feel that his life is shaping up well, and to the same question he'll answer 'Fine'. But then he is latching on to a fixed inner context of life and knows that he is being asked only about this context. But the Russian person is alluding to another, not at all an inner context.
>
> Besides which my family's experience has left me with some impressions. My grandfather and grandmother escaped abroad in 1918. They weren't going to, but were forced out, as it were. First of all they moved south and then they were put out to sea in a steamer after which they left to wander all over Europe. They tried to build a life for themselves there, but nothing came of it because emigration was dying out, having consumed itself. Moreover, events in Europe compelled Russians to wander around from country to country. In 1923 they decided to return, calculating that they could get by. At first nothing presaged the tragic exodus (this was the period of NEP)[1], but then things gathered pace. They were sinking up to their necks in that life, but there was practically no chance of emigrating. And there was nowhere to go. Europe was already gripped in the first wave of fascism and America was a very hazy speck. And the feeling for example that no matter where you were to go to you would regardless be coming back, that, regardless, nothing would come of it, left me from my childhood years with a sensation of the irreparable nature of the drama of life. All journeys, whether voluntary or involuntary, to some blessed lands or other, always end in nothing. There are no blessed islands and you are chained to here, like it or not, and you needn't expect anything good in life. The twentieth century is a time lived with a look back in time through grandmothers, grandfathers and parents (ibid: 147-149).

Tolstaya is often included amongst the genre 'women writers': when the topic of women writers and 'feminine prose' was raised in an interview from1987 it brought a forthright response. Tolstaya was asked why it was that Russian literature, rich in women poets, can boast of only a few women prose writers:

[1] New Economic Policy

> True enough, there aren't many women prose writers - I don't know why. But so-called 'feminine prose' is abundant. It has a variety of hallmarks: confusion of daily routine with Life, 'sugariness' and 'beauty', smacking of a fancy-goods store. One feature is particularly notable – the author's mercantile psychology.
>
> 'Feminine prose' is mostly written by men. But, on the other hand, there are also women eager to write 'men's prose'. I find this deplorable, for a woman painting a mustache on her face is disagreeable. A woman's authorship (just like a man's) must be sensed in the very texture of writing (Martynenko 1987).

In 1992 she drew parallels between the then current situation of American intelligentsia and Soviet writers in the 1920s, in particular noting her attitude to political correctness and feminism:

> In the 20s many Soviet writers had to change the way they wrote because of fear, because of conformism, because the very fact that they wrote in a modernist way was regarded as outrageous after the beginning of the 30s. Ideological political correctness was imposed on literature.
>
> The modern ideas that prevail on campuses are ideas we had in totalitarian countries in the 20s and 30s. Political correctness and feminism – practical feminism, women's studies and all those things. It's absolutely a copy of ideas connected with class struggle and class literature in the 20s (Mestrovic 1992).

Tolstaya, when asked what she thought was her mission as a writer, responded:

> It is to return to people the humanistic impulse I myself have received from books. Only what is charged with the love of man is truly valuable. Aspiring to goodness is valuable in itself. Even gloomy, cheerless pieces of writing sometimes make for good things, helping one see a way out of the darkness (Martynenko 1987).

Some details of Tolstaya's inspiration to start writing were forthcoming in her *Publishers Weekly* interview (Mestrovic 1992): she disclosed that, as a voracious reader, she also felt frustrated by the lack of good new literature, so at the age of 32 she decided to become a writer. She looked for inspiration to Russian literature of

the 20th century, particularly the work of Vladimir Nabokov. 'When I read Nabokov, I just jumped up,' she says. Nabokov has remained her major inspiration (ibid: 38).

She began to write stories about her childhood. Tolstaya wanted to explore, among other things, the psychology of the adults she had known as a young girl, but subsequently she broadened her horizons to a wide range of characters: 'I want to create a typical person, always a little bit crazy. […] all literature is about deviating from a certain norm. I am fascinated with everything I see as a deviation from normal logic – old people, sclerotics, children, stupid people' (ibid).

At that time (1992) she noted that the current turmoil in the Soviet Union had affected her writing negatively, but that she felt that all Soviet writers were going through a similar experience. She claimed that 'to write, you need to have some sort of stability' in the society represented in the writing. 'If everything is moving so quickly, you don't know how to deal with it, you don't know whom to address, you don't know what to write, because everything seems so ephemeral.' In the wake of the demise of the Soviet Union she feared the onset of civil war (ibid).

At the time the following question was put to her, Tolstaya was living in America. She was asked whether she still considered herself to be a Russian writer:

> I know very well that I am a Russian writer […] when I have to write articles for American magazines about Russian matters, then I stop being purely Russian. Because I start taking into consideration the mentality and volume of knowledge of those for whom I am writing an article. For about a year I was writing small articles for *Moskovskie novosti* (Moscow news) […] I cannot do this living in this country. But when I was doing this, I understood that practically none of these articles could be translated into other languages and understood by people of other cultures […] when I am writing these things, I use a number of hidden quotations, citations that Russians recognize but no one outside of Russia is able to recognize […] so what I want to say is that I am Russian and that I am writing my prose in Russian for Russians. And that is why I am a purely Russian writer. Of course, everything can be translated into other languages so that other people can read it. But I am much more Russian in my prose than in my articles. In my articles, I am a Russian trying to be understood by non-Russians.

Here we might comment that Tolstaya appears to employ the tenets of Skopos theory (Vermeer 2000) inasmuch as she concedes tailoring articles to the needs and knowledge of the target culture within a commercial, journalistic environment. The interview continues:

> Are you bothered by the fact that Russian writers are no longer prophets, that they have just become writers?
>
> No, I am not bothered by that fact, because a very good writer is a writer. One of the best writers is Nabokov. Is he a prophet? In many ways, he is not. He did not profess anything […] and the prophets, they are stoned in the end. If you want to be a prophet, be prepared. Wait for the crowd with stones. Just wait for it' (Rich 1995: 90-91).

'Give me a sense of what you write' was the question put to her in an earlier interview (Davies 1990):

> The real things that interest me are people from the psychological points of view, as human beings […] I believe in eternal problems. So from my point of view there is no history. There are all sorts of events but there is no progress in history as many people believe. A man is a man whether he lives in ancient Rome, in the middle ages or in the present […] to love, not to love. To want to be loved. That's what I'm interested in […] so I have to place [my characters] in the surroundings and the scenery I know. And this is the scenery of our everyday life in the Soviet Union.
>
> As it is a strange life it can be defined in many ways. A sad life. A horrible life, a fearful life. Yet to survive in that crazy life you have to develop a certain sense of humour which allows you to survive. Those who have no sense of humour are in a desperate way. Very soon they perish as human beings. They become half animal (ibid: 26).

A final but relevant comment, given the subject of this dissertation, was the response when Tolstaya was asked by *The Independent* (Lambert 1990) about translation: she responded that her translators were good, yet when she read her stories in English it was like a black and white photograph of what she had written.

Chapter 1. Stylistics and Themes of the Postmodern in *Кысь*

After an introductory section on the stylistics of postmodernism, this chapter turns to the specifics of Russian postmodernism and instances that are illustrated by examples in *Кысь*, and concludes with the reception of the novel by critics inside Russia.

1.1. Stylistics of Postmodernism

In 'The Postmodern Turn' the theorist Ihab Hassan lists a 'catena' of postmodern features, a 'paratactic list'. 'Together they limn a region of postmodern "indetermanences" (indeterminancy lodged in immanence) in which critical pluralism takes shape.' (Hassan 1987:168). However Hassan is still moved to confess: 'But what is postmodernism? I can still propose no rigorous definition of it, any more than I could define modernism itself' (ibid:167). Nevertheless he proposes the following outline of the main features of postmodernist fiction:

> *1* **Indeterminacy** or rather, indeterminancies. These include all manner of ambiguities, ruptures, and displacements affecting knowledge and society.
>
> *2* **Fragmentation**. Indeterminacy often follows from fragmentation. The postmodernist only disconnects; fragments are all he pretends to trust. His ultimate opprobrium is "totalization" – any synthesis whatever, social, epistemic, even poetic. Hence his preference for montage, collage, the found or cut-up literary object, for paratactic over hypotactic forms, metonymy over metaphor, schizophrenia over paranoia. Hence too his recourse to paradox, paralogy, parabasis, paracriticism, the openness of brokenness, unjustified margins.
>
> *3* **Decanonization**. In the largest sense, this applies to all canons, all conventions of authority […] a massive "delegitimation" of the mastercodes in society, a desuetude of the metanarratives, favoring instead "les petites histories," which preserve the heterogeneity of language games. Thus, from the "death of god" the "death of the author" and "death of the father," from the derision of authority to revision of the curriculum, we decanonize culture, demystify knowledge, deconstruct the languages of power, desire, deceit. Derision and revision are versions of subversion …

4 **Self-less-ness, Depth-less-ness**. Postmodernism vacates the traditional self, stimulating self-effacement – a fake flatness, without inside/outside or its opposite, self-multiplication, self-reflection.

5 **The Unpresentable, Unrepresentable**. Like its predecessor, pomo art is irrealist, aniconic. Even its "magic realism" dissolves in ethereal states; its hard, flat surfaces repel mimesis. Postmodern literature, particularly, often seeks its limits, entertains its "exhaustion," subverts itself in forms of articulate "silence".

6 **Irony.** In absence of a cardinal principle or paradigm, we turn to play, interplay, dialogue, polylogue, allegory, self-reflection – in short to irony. This irony assumes indeterminacy, multivalence; it aspires to clarity, the clarity of demystification, the pure light of absence.

7 **Hybridization** or the mutant replication of genres, including parody, travesty, pastiche. The "de-definition," deformation, of cultural genres engenders equivocal modes: "paracriticism," […] the "non-fiction" novel," and a promiscuous category of "para-literature" or "threshold literature," at once young and very old. Cliché and plagiarism […] parody and pastiche, pop and kitsch enrich *re*-presentation. In this view, image or replica may be as valid as its model. This makes for a different concept of tradition, one in which continuity and discontinuity, high and low culture, mingle not to imitate, but to expand the past in the present.

8 **Carnivalization**. Bakhtin's term which embraces indeterminacy, fragmentation, decanonization, selflessness, irony, hybridisation. But the term also conveys the comic or absurdist ethos of postmodernism […] carnivalization further means "polyphony," the centrifugal power of language, […] participation in the wild disorder of life, the immanence of laughter.

9 **Performance, Participation**. Indeterminacy elicits participation; gaps must be filled. The postmodern text, verbal or nonverbal, invites performance; it wants to be written, revised, answered, acted out.

Summing up, Hassan sets out a useful table of schematic differences which will enable us to distinguish between those stylistic features characterising modernist literature (mainly 'hieratic, hypotactical and formalist') (Hassan 1987:91);

postmodernist fiction can be seen by contrast to be 'playful', paratactical and deconstructionist' (ibid:91):

MODERNISM	POSTMODERNISM
Form (conjunctive, closed)	Antiform (disjunctive, open)
Purpose	Play
Design	Chance
Hierarchy	Anarchy
Mastery/Logos	Exhaustion/Silence
Art Object/Finished Work	Process/Performance/Happening
Creation/Totalization	Decreation/Deconstruction
Synthesis	Antithesis
Presence	Absence
Genre/Boundary	Text/Intertext
Paradigm	Syntagm
Hypotaxis	Parataxis
Metaphor	Metonomy
Selection	Combination
Root/Depth	Rhizome/Surface
Signified	Signifier
Lisible (Readerly)	Scriptible (Writerly)

Generally speaking, it is worth noting that the above scheme does usefully attempt to differentiate between those epistemological and ontological concerns which Brian McHale posits as the basis for separating postmodernist and modernist devices. According to McHale – the *epistemological* (that is knowledge and understanding of the world) characterises modernist fiction, the latter deploying strategies to engage and foreground questions such as "How can I interpret this world of which I am a part? And what am I in it?" (McHale 1987:9). McHale's second thesis is that the dominant of postmodernist fiction is *ontological.* Such fiction uses strategies which foreground questions such as "Which world is this?", "What is to be done in it?" and "What is a world?" (ibid:10)

For McHale, the 'post' of postmodernist fiction should be seen as an 'element of logical and historical consequence rather than sheer temporal posteriority. Postmodernism follows from modernism, in some sense, more than it follows after modernism' (McHale 1987:5). In this model, says McHale, 'epistemology is *backgrounded*, as the price for foregrounding ontology' and it is the dominant which specifies the 'urgency' and 'order' of such ontological questions (ibid:11).

Although such catalogues of postmodernist features as Hassan's are often offered in terms of oppositions to features of modernist features, McHale does not imply that such features are therefore linear and directional, but rather that they are 'bidirectional and reversible'. Again, he offers 'the dominant' as providing a useful key to their underlying *systematicity,* ie why these features should 'cluster' in a particular way.

In so doing, McHale is proposing the Russian formalist concept of 'the dominant', defined by Roman Jakobson as "The focusing component of a work of art: it rules, determines and transforms the remaining components. It is the dominant which guarantees the integrity of the structure […] a poetic work [is] a structured system, a regularly ordered hierarchical set of artistic devices. Poetic evolution is a shift in this hierarchy […] The image of literary history substantially changes; it becomes incomparably richer and at the same time more monolithic, more synthetic and ordered, than were the *membra disjecta* of previous literary scholarship' (Jakobson 1971: 82- 87).

-In turn McHale himself classifies several devices used in postmodernist fiction, delineated as follows and to which reference will be made subsequently in describing the features of Tolstaya's novel which allow us to classify it as postmodernist fiction:

1 **Intertextual Zones:** 'an intertextual space is constituted whenever we recognize the relations among two or more texts, or between texts and larger categories such as genre, school, period. There are a number of ways of foregrounding this intertextual space and integrating it in the text's structure, but none is more effective than the device of "borrowing" a character from another text – "transworld identity" (ibid 56-57). What McHale terms 'retour de personnage' can also be parodied in order 'to violate, and thereby foreground' the ontological boundaries between fictional worlds'(ibid:58).

2 **Science fiction:** Most postmodernist futures are grim utopias. The motif of a world after the holocaust or some apocalyptic breakdown recurs. Such dystopias employ the "zero degree" of temporal displacement '… without making any particular provision for bridging the temporal gap between present and future; that bridge is left for the reader to build' (ibid:67).

3 **Hesitation, banality, resistance:** McHale argues that postmodernist fiction has close affinities with the genre of the fantastic and with that of science-fiction. It is able to draw upon the motifs and topoi of the fantastic because this genre is governed by the ontological dominant.

4 **Apocryphal history:** Apocryphal history, creative anachronism and historical fantasy are the typical strategies of the postmodernist revisionist historical novel; 'the effect is to juxtapose the officially-accepted version of what happened […] with another radically dissimilar version of the world' (ibid:90). The tension between the two creates an 'ontological flicker' the official version at times being eclipsed by the apocryphal version and vice-versa.

5 **Styled Worlds:** McHale identifies several postmodernist strategies for the foregrounding of style. These include 'lexical exhibitionism' which involves introducing words which are highly conspicuous, even self-foregrounding. These can involve rare, pedantic, archaic, neologistic, technical and foreign words. McHale quotes Donald Barthelme as including lexical stupidities and trivialities in this category too, '"Filling" or "stuff" […] enunciating an aesthetics of those aspects of language that may be seen as a model of the trash phenomenon, language that possesses a "sludge" quality. (Barthelme, 1968: 96-97)

McHale argues that, 'Words disengaged from syntax – this could be a definition of the catalogue structure, a recurrent device of postmodernist style. From the ontological point of view, catalogues are paradoxical. On the one hand, they can appear to assert the full presence of a world, as they do in the Biblical psalms […] a crowded world, one so inexhaustibly rich in objects that it defies our abilities to master it through syntax; the best we can do is to begin naming its many parts, without any hope of ever finishing. Yet at the same time, the decontextualization of words through the catalogue structure can have the opposite effect, that of evacuating language of presence, leaving only a shell behind – a word list, a mere exhibition of words […] catalogues in postmodernist fiction seem inevitably to gravitate toward the word-list pole, even if they begin as assemblages of objects' (McHale, 1987:153).

The sentence, too, can be manipulated. A characteristic of postmodernist writing is what might be called the device of 'deliberate non-fluency: the construction of

sentences so awkward (to the point of ungrammaticality) that it is the sentence-structure itself that fixes the attention, distracting us from whatever content that structure might carry […] superfluous commas that disturb the rhythmical flow, deliberate anti-climaxes, elaborate constructions disproportionate to their trivial content' (ibid:154). McHale quotes the writer Donald Barthelme and his proposed aesthetics of what he calls 'back-broke sentences'

> 'I look for a particular kind of sentence, perhaps more often the awkward than the beautiful. A back-broke sentence is interesting […] a way of backing into a story – of getting past the reader's hardwon armor (Barthelme 1988: 34)

adding that 'back-broke sentences, taken to their ultimate extreme, yield what might be called invertebrate sentences, rambling, apparently interminable, shape-shifting constructions […] the sentence is its own content (McHale 1987:15).

According to McHale, the *abecedary* [1]too can play a part in the foregrounding of style in postmodernist writing. It is possible to heighten still further the visibility of the reconstructive process by taking the words of the text continuum literally, *a la lettre* (ibid:156)

> ' … this determination of world by word is normally kept in the background, below the threshold of perceptibility, allowing us to efface the text continuum in favour of a world which we may think of as free-standing, independent of the text's language, or even as itself determining the text's language – the reverse of the true state of affairs […] an effective tool for ordering words, and therefore for ordering a world, alphabetization has sometimes been used to impose arbitrary order on postmodernist texts. This is especially characteristic of […] hybrid fictional-nonfictional, discursive-narrative texts which are often made up of discontinuous, heterogeneous fragments. Such fragments may be assembled into a transparently arbitrary order by assigning each fragment a chapter-heading or key-word and alphabetizing them. Alphabetical order has not been fixed on in these texts faute de mieux but precisely in order to flaunt their haphazardness […] we are arrested by the contents of this text … and simultaneously alienated, distanced by its transparently

[1] Term derived from late Latin *abecedarius*, 'abecedarian', 'arranged alphabetically' (from the names of the letters 'a', 'b', 'c', 'd', + AN. (mid 17th century) (OED). We may view such terminology in itself as an example of language 'calling attention to itself', of self-reflexivity, a prime feature of postmodernism.

> arbitrary form. Ontological instability is the consequence: the world flickers between presence and absence, between reconstructed reality and words on the page. In all these *abecedarian* texts, […] ontological structure becomes a foreground source of tension and disorientation; it cannot be taken for granted (ibid:157-159).

The above summary of postmodern characteristics demonstrates some of the techniques used by Russian writers of postmodern texts to evolve new principles of fiction writing. Most prominent among them are the rejection of the mimetic function of literature and a change in emphasis to that of 'the constructed nature of a literary text; self-consciousness and laying bare the process of fictional world-making; intertextuality and the interjection of different codes, discourses or voices traversing the text; and the foregrounding of style by distracting the reader's attention from the projected world and fixing it on the linguistic medium.' (Kolesnikoff 2001)

The focus of the dissertation will be on the different strategies used by Tatyana Tolstaya to foreground style and concentrate attention on language as the most prominent element of the postmodernist text. The predominance and scintillating nature of language in Kys' is clearly remarked upon by Russian critics of the novel, and conversely in a negative sense by critics of the translated version. I will argue that this is a result of a 'mimetic' and 'domesticating' approach to the translation, which has resulted in many areas in a 'normalisation' of language entirely absent in the source text.

The methodology of a stylistic analysis of the novel will be that outlined by Leech and Short (1981) and the supporting instrument of analysis the Wordsmith language analysis computer program (Scott 1997).

1.2. Stylistics of Russian Postmodern Prose

Postmodernism is a term much used by Russian writers and critics referring to many new works of literature emerging from Russia in the late 1980s and 1990s . Whilst an exact definition of the term remains elusive, the generally accepted view of

most scholars, that postmodernism is a response to modernism, is rejected by Shneidman in this comment expressed in 1995:

> Post-modernism is not a reaction to modernism but rather of repugnance towards former Soviet social, ideological and aesthetic values, and a reaction against socialist realism. It is a combination of what can be called post-socialist realism with an admixture of different elements of Western post-modernist art. In the late 1980's, most works previously forbidden by Soviet censors, or created in the Soviet cultural underground, were included in the realm of post-modernist art. This literature lifted former taboos and opened its pages to the discussion of issues such as sexual deviance, homosexuality, lesbianism and drug abuse (Shneidman, 1995:173)

Ten years later Shneidman bemoaned Russian writing of the previous decade:

> The 1990s was, perhaps, the first decade in Russian literary history that did not bring to the fore either a single name of a great new writer or a work of prose which could be placed among the recognized classics. Today, the novel in Russia is often no longer a carefully constructed artistic edifice, but rather an accidental collage, written in most instances in poor Russian and inundated by slang and foreign words. The structure of this novel is loose and there is no psychological investigation of the reasons which motivate human action. Characterization is shunned, and direct speech and Aesopian language are replaced in such novels with the play of words and fragments of various styles. The modern hero is often characterized by a sick imagination and morbid fantasy […] similarly, Tat'iana Tolstaia's recent novel *Kys'* is a mixture of fantasy, mythological symbolism, elements of science fiction, skaz, anti-utopia and Russian folklore, but the only positive feature of the novel is its figurative ornamental language (Shneidman 2005).

In this chapter, an introductory look at the major features of the Russian avant-garde movement since the late sixties may allow us some general definitions of the set of general characteristic elements of Russian postmodernist writing, which will in turn serve as background to an analysis of Tolstaya's novel *Кысь*, a novel Igor Vinogradov, chief editor of the literary journal *Континент* (Kontinent), has referred to as an 'absolutely empty postmodernist plaything, very skilfully done' (Rakhaeve: 2002 trans. LCK).

Vinogradov's point here is that contemporary literature in general, and Tolstaya in particular, approach literature *по горизонтали* (on a 'horizontal' level), thus ensuring that 'the vertical approach to evaluation has gone out of fashion, and all values are the same'(ibid.). Vinogradov would seem to be asserting that postmodernism comprises only *representational* techniques, unable to scale the heights of high passion and morality, warning us that 'in ten years time new master craftsmen will come along, with their own "vision"' and that 'that little rain cloud' he has seen will have its little grey blanket cast off.' (ibid)

I would like to argue that Tolstaya's novel can certainly be analysed as a postmodernist text, and that such a text need not preclude levels of passion and emotion, but indeed that the differences between it and the 'realist' or 'socialist realist' texts lie in the progression from modernism to post-modernism or what I will argue is even a *neo-modernist* text. I could argue that the confidence of the classical text, drawn from the strength of narrative structure and style to represent the external world, is replaced in modernist texts by concepts such as self-consciousness and self-referentiality, wherein the very foregrounding of stylistic elements, open-ended narratives, mirror structures, the blurring of the boundaries between fiction and reality, parody, multiplicity of narrative levels all find strong representation.

The advent of 'alternative prose' in Russia appears to have loosened strictures in the US as well, at least with regard to the nature of acceptable translations. As political readings of literary works recede so formal and stylistic questions have come to the fore. At the same time, the idea of "abusive" writing has become more acceptable both for original works and for translations, leading to increased attention to stylistic devices in translation. As we have seen, postmodern writing distinguishes itself largely on the basis of stylistic innovation and rejection of the formal strictures of earlier times. While a tendency to neglect such stylistic nuances of the text in favour of conveying the plot and normalizing the diction will of course lead to a devaluing of the translation, I will attempt to show that an overly 'faithful' reproduction of such devices in translation is not, in fact, always a successful strategy and will argue that a translator, no less than original author, can also avail himself of literary theory and criticism.

According to the critic Michael Epstein, postmodernism is 'the production of reality as a series of plausible copies' (Epstein et al 1999:x), or what the French philosopher Jean Baudrillard has called 'simulation', which the latter defines as 'a hyper-real henceforth sheltered from the imaginary, and from any distinction between the real and the imaginary, leaving room only for the original recurrence of models and for the simulated generation of differences' (Baudrillard 1994:3).

A key point of difference for Epstein is that in Russia, ideas have always tended to substitute for reality, since in Soviet society reality was made to coincide with those ideas by which it was described, thus becoming nothing other than the creation of those ideas where ideology had re-created the world in its own image and likeness. Epstein points out that it was the 1970s before Russian verbal postmodernism was born, synonymous with the emergence of the Moscow art movement of conceptualism, 'using quotation, silence, and a parodic conformism [...] setting language against itself, they exposed the illusions of the self, the overdeterminations of ideology and monological discourse, thereby opening Soviet-Russian culture to the experience of *silence*, the something (or no-thing) that lies beyond.' (Epstein et al 1999: viii).

> Signs of heroic labour, collectivism, the striving for a Communist future and so on, which were previously taken seriously as the signified reality itself, now were perceived to be valid or real at the level of the sign, making them susceptible to all sorts of linguistic games (ibid:x)

For Epstein, the 'homogenization' of Soviet society under Socialist Realism had led to a new 'culture of mediocrity', a process which provided the basis of postmodern development. This thinking is taken further by another Russian critic, Mark Lipovetsky, when he maintains that there was actually a fall in usage of the terminology 'postmodern' among the wide readership which accrued after the success of the novels of Victor Pelevin and Vladimir Sorokin at the end of the eighties and beginning of the nineties, and then Tatyana Tolstaya with her novel *Кысь*. Prior to the end of the 1980s, postmodernism was, according to Lipovetsky, synonymous with the literature of alternative socialist realism, or simply mainstream realism, leading at the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s to such synonyms as 'avant-garde',

'underground', 'current' or 'alternative' literature; consequently Russian postmodernism is distinctive in nature, and differs from the Western model (Lipovetsky 2002).

The term then became synonymous with mainstream realism, and it was from this period that the current synonyms for postmodernism, such as 'avant-garde', 'underground' and 'alternative literature' sprang, thus underlining the differences between Russian postmodernism, and Western postmodernism. According to Dr Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover, we should therefore see Russian postmodernism as an 'element in the process of reclaiming the lost years of the historical avant-garde and of regaining the self-reflexivity inherent therein, a self-reflexivity which manifests itself in self-questioning and experimentation, together with new ways of seeing and portraying reality' (Epstein et al 1999: 231).

From the point of view of translation, the question we will explore in this section is, 'If the mode of representation in postmodernist literature is experimental and this extends to language, what are the implications for contemporary translation theory in dealing with this postmodern linguistic experimentation?' How does the translator deal with issues of referentiality, since History in postmodernist thought is 'relegated to the scrap heap', and the very notion of language as *langue*, or code, repository of pre-existing meaning is subverted. (ibid). Viewing language as a 'rhizome', operating similarly to a 'fascicular root' system, and involving the idea of multiplicity without linguistic universals (ibid), certainly opens up traditional notions of 'equivalence' in translation to closer examination. .

This section will focus in detail on different stylistic strategies used within Tolstaya's novel to 'play with the signifier' (ibid: vii) in order to highlight style, and make language and thus the text itself, the predominant component of a literary work. A key area of examination will be wordplay where the author subverts standard forms of language, where that which the critic Nina Kolesnikoff calls 'lexical exhibitionism' is seen as an essential postmodern literary device in order to 'expose the falseness of old notions and reject the language of the rational and pragmatic' (Smith, 1997: 116).

1.3. Postmodernism and the Politics of Difference

Postmodernist writers generally aim to show the ways in which the discourses of power are used in all societies to marginalize subordinate groups. According to Butler (2002:56) such discourses of power do not just contribute to the decentring and deconstruction of the self; they also serve to marginalize those people who do not partake in them. In general we can say that postmodernist thought, through its denial of any dominant ideology, makes room for and encourages a politics of difference:

Under postmodern conditions, the ordered class politics preferred by socialists has given way to a far more diffuse and pluralistic identity politics, which often involves the self-conscious assertion of a marginalized identity against the dominant discourse (ibid).

As an example of 'identity politics' in the West the relationship between postmodernism and feminism is cited - a railing against the situation where women are excluded from the patriarchal symbolic order, or from dominant male discourse, which indeed would suggest they have been 'othered' as inferior with respect to this discourse. When this takes place, it is clear that women are subjected to a 'false hierarchy' by being assigned weak values, as opposed to the strong ones invested in masculinity.

If we accept that much feminist thought chimes with postmodernism in that it rails against the legitimating metadiscourse used by males and thus attempts to loosen the conceptual boundaries of our thoughts about gender (and race, sexual orientation and ethnicity), we might find it fruitful to look at Tolstaya's characterisation of women in the novel, in order to establish whether such a viewpoint is really at such odds with her protestations of anti-(Western)feminism, summarised in the interview excerpts below. In many ways we can draw a parallel between Tolstaya's denunciation of Western feminism and her espousal of *разум*, i.e. logic and rationality, as opposed to false notions of the Russian *душа* or soul (as in the interviews with P Barta and M Mestrovic quoted in the Introduction). This is a stance which chimes with Butler's questioning of postmodernist thinking when he asks whether the oppositional character of such thinking calls for an 'irreducible pluralism', cut off from any

'unifying frameworks of belief, and, more widely, a rejection of 'those Enlightenment ideals that underlie the legal structures of most Western democratic societies and that aimed at *universalizable* ideals of equality and justice'. (ibid.)

A further comment in this area from Tolstaya is taken from an interview she gave in 1990:

> I sense that in the West women oppress men, and that women are themselves constricted by pressures to be as masculine as possible […] Soviet women have been less repressed than Soviet men. Persecution destroys something in the personality […] our men were driven over the edge and many of them lost any sense of ethical criteria. Women weren't; and they remained human. They tried to protect their own little space from the influence of the state. They locked themselves in with family and children […]
>
> The western world is built on logic; our world is built rather on intuition, reflection and myth. Irrationality permeates our lives. And that's a traditionally feminine principle […] it seems to me that at its most elevated the human spirit is androgynous. It encompasses both masculine and feminine principles […] feminists drag physiology into literature. They maintain that a man can't feel as a woman can. That's rubbish. Sex isn't the most important thing about a human being. It's primitive to suggest that it is. But then there are many primitive traits in western society … (Maryniak 1990 trans. LCK).

Although the novel *Кысь* does not go too deeply into the characterisation of female characters, it is clear that the figures of Olen'ka and Varvara stand in opposition to each other. The well-off Olen'ka with her dazzling beauty is soon reduced to being overweight and crude, while Varvara, who caught mice and swapped them for the books she loved, was fated to suffer a cockscomb sticking out of her one eye. However, Benedikt is moved to cry upon Varvara's death, while that of Olen'ka is not, it appears, unwelcome, and so intellect is seen to triumph over superficial beauty. In many ways this judgement echoes that of Tolstaya made in an earlier story 'The Moon Came Out', describing the life of a woman forsaken in love, condemned to live life in a dreary communal apartment:

On the summer boulevards sat old women who had known a better life: gilded cups, the frosty flora of lace hems, the tiny antlike facets of foreign fragrance vials, and perhaps – indeed, most likely – secret lovers; they sat with one leg crossed over the other, their gaze lifted to where the heavenly evening theatre silently lavished burning crimsons, golden treasures; and the loving western light crowned the blue hair of these former women with tea roses.

But nearby, heavily spreading their swollen legs, with drooping hands and drooping heads wrapped in dotted kerchiefs, flames all snuffed out, like dead swans sat those who had lived for years in brown communal kitchens, in dim corridors, those who had slept on iron frame beds next to deep-set windows, where beyond the speckled blue casserole, beyond the heavy smell of fermentation[1]*, beyond the tearstained glass, another person's wall darkens and swells with autumn anguish* (Tolstaya 1992, trans J Gambrell: 61).

This passage, lamenting the unfulfilled passing of years of poorer women, contrasted with the better off, and the undignified, demeaning fate of life in a communal flat would suggest that Tolstaya does in deed have much empathy for the lot of the normal little woman, as well as 'little man'.

I have selected three examples from *Кысь*, the first two of which feature unflattering references to women.

*- Батюшка истопник, Бенедикт Карпыч, дай огоньку**! Моя-то дура** зазевалась, а печь возьми да и погасни. А мы только-только собрались оладьи спроворить, что ты будешь делать...* (R:23)

"Father Stoker, Benedikt Karpich, let us have a bit of fire! That idiot over there wasn't watching, and my stove went out. And we were just about to fry up a batch of pancakes, what can you do ..." (E:14)

In this example it is not immediately clear from the translation that 'that idiot over there' is in fact female, and moreover a reference to his wife, here using the construction of possessive pronoun plus particle *–mo* to refer to members of the

[1] Gambrell's translation of the words 'za tiazhelym dukhom kvasheniia' (Tolstaya 2002:119), as 'beyond the heavy smell of fermentation' may here be rather literal, in the sense that Tolstaya may instead be referring to the general 'mustiness' engendered in a cramped area with limited facilities shared and neglected by too many people. I am grateful to James Halliday of Heriot Watt University for bringing this to my attention (LCK).

family in demotic speech (Kapanadze in Zemskaia and Shmelev 1984: 126-7). The translation seems to be normalised.

Спасибо, что вы есть! Спасибо! - это бабы. (R: 76)
"Thank you for being! Thank you," added the women. (E: 52)

Here, the rather dismissive verbless last phrase *это бабы* 'this was the women', using the colloquial form *бабы*, a term for married peasant women, here almost with the sense of an amorphous, collective 'womenfolk', thus a possible '*this from the womenfolk'*, is rather dignified in the target text by the inclusion of the verb 'added'. Again there is the slight suggestion that the translator has 'normalised' the translation in using the bland noun 'women'.

Interestingly for various commentaries which paint Tolstaya as an anti-feminist there are some scenes in the novel which, while seemingly mocking the meekness and passivity of women can be interpreted as a judicious attack on patriarchy, not least the *Ukaz* or decree announced by the 'Greatest Murza' to announce a public holiday (complete with work) for Women's Day which follows in the next Section.

1.4. The Decrees

The decree referred to above is reproduced below.

Указ *Вот как я есть Федор Кузьмич Каблуков, слава мне, Набольший Мурза, долгих лет мне жизни, Секлетарь и Академик и Герой и Мореплаватель и Плотник, и как я есть в непрестанной об людях заботе, приказываю.* *+ Вот еще какое дело вспомнил совсем забыл с государственными делами замотавшись:* *+ Восьмого Марта тоже Праздник Международный Женский День.* *+ Энтот праздник не выходной.* *+ Значит на работу выходить, но работать спустя рукава.* *+ Женский День значит навроде Бабского Праздника.* *+ В энтот день всем бабам почет и уважение как есть они Жена и Мать и Бабушка и Племянница или другая какая Пигалица малая всех уважать.*	*DECREE* *Now hear this. Since I am Fyodor Kuzmich Kablukov, Glory to me, the Greatest Murza, Long May I Live, Seckletary and Academishun and Hero and Ship Captain, and Carpenter, and seeing as how I am constantly worrying about the people, I command:* *Oh, and there's something else I remembered, I'd completely forgotten it since I was so busy with state affairs:* *The Eighth of March is also a Holiday, International Women's Day.* *This Holiday isn't a day off.* *That means you have to go to work, but you can take it easy.* *Women's Day means like a Woman's Holiday.* *On this day you have to honor and respect all women since they are Wife and Mother and Grandmother and Niece and any other Little Girls and respect all of them.*

+ В энтот Праздник их не бить не колошматить ничего такого обычного чтоб не делать, а пущай она Жена и Мать и Бабушка и Племянница, или другая какая Пигалица малая с утра пораньше встанет пирогов напечет оладушков того-сего наваляет все чисто вымоет полы подметет лавки надраит воды с колодца наносит белье там исподнее али верхнее намоет-настирает у кого коврики али половички пущай все хорошо выколотит а то я вас знаю пылишша в избе хоть нос зажимай. Дров пущай нарубит баньку растопит помоется как следоват. Стол накроет побогаче блины горкой закусь всякая может с Нового Года чего недоедено все на стол тащи. *+ С работы придя проздравить Жену и Мать и Бабушку и Племянницу или другую какую Пигалицу малую с Международным Женским Днем.* *+ Сказать: "Желаю вам Жена и Мать и Бабушка и Племянница или другая какая Пигалица малая счастья в жизне успехов в работе мирного неба над головой".* *+ Всякую бабу, хоть Соседка хоть кто такими же словами вежливо проздравлять.* *+ Опосля пей-гуляй, ешь что хочешь веселись, но в меру.* *Каблуков* (R:129-130)	*On this Holiday don't give them a thrashing or a licking, they don't have to do all the usual things, but Wife and Mother and Grandmother and Niece and any other Little Girls should get up earlier in the morning and bake pies, pancakes and all sorts of things, wash everything clean, sweep the floors and polish the benches, carry the water from the well, wash out the underwear and outerwear, and whoever has rugs or mats they should beat them all well or else I know you, there'll be so much dust in the izba you'll have to hold your nose. She should chop wood for the bathhouse, light the fire and scrub herself all over. Set the table with bliny and a mountain of all kinds of snacks. Maybe there's some leftovers from New Year's you can put out on the table.* *When you get to work congratulate every Wife and Mother and Grandmother and Niece and any other Little Girls with International Women's Day.* *Say: "Wife and Mother and Grandmother and Niece and any other Little Girls I wish you happiness in life, success in work, and a peaceful sky over your head."* *And every woman you meet, even your Neighborlady, say the same polite words.* *Later on, drink and make merry, eat what you want, have a good time, but within reason.* *Kablukov* (E: 90-91)

First and foremost we may see this passage as an example of *стёб*, (i.e. 'styob' or 'mickey-taking') on the language of Soviet officialdom, along the same lines as the slogan *Мыши - наша опора* (R:9), *Mice Are Our Mainstay* (E:4), a slogan taught by the Great Murza to his people. D. N. Ushakov's dictionary (1935) lists for example a similar slogan: *Главное для революции – это наличие социальной опоры* – (The main thing for the revolution is the presence of social support). As pointed out by Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade (1999: 322) such texts would have resonance with those who lived in Soviet times as a play on totalitarian discourse and might well bring a wry smile to readers.

Turning to the decree itself (one of four such in the novel) this may also be read as a parody of such addresses normally issued to Soviet people before a public holiday by the Central Committee of the CPSU, addresses which are themselves based on the style of ecclesiastical sermons (ibid: 323). In the English translation Gambrell

cleverly mirrors this and sets the tone of the address by adding the opening formula *Now hear this*, which will alert the target culture readers to an imminent public announcement in line with the formula uttered by English-speaking town-criers – i.e. *Hear ye, Hear ye, Now hear this*. Tolstaya may be seen to be parodying the famous radio address of 3 July 1941 in which Stalin roused the Soviet people to face the threat of Hitler and Nazism. The address began:

> *Comrades, citizens, brothers and sisters, men of our Army and Navy! My words are addressed to you, dear friends!* (Stalin 1946: 9)

In Tolstaya's version, the novel, paternalistic and expressive element in Stalin's address to the nation is mirrored in Kablukov's *и как я есть в непрестанной об людях заботе* (and seeing as how I am constantly worrying about the people).

There is also great humour in the distorted, demotic speech used by Kablukov, starting with the use of *Федор как я есть Кузьмич Каблуков* when the infinitive *есть* (to be) is used incorrectly, seemingly inserted to reinforce and assert his power as leader. The correct form of the first person present indicative in Old Russian for 'I am' would be *Я есмь* (Matthews:123) This distorted form is repeated later with the infinitive again being used instead of the third person plural of the present indicative which is *суть*.[1]

A common feature of demotic speech is also demonstrated here when the first 'r' of the word *Секретарь* (secretary) is dissimilated to become a humorous *Секлетарь,* and this is mirrored in the translation. The main humour of the piece however is in the content, which ably illustrates that International Women's Day is in fact no holiday for women, as there is still much work to be done, spelled out by the long list of duties to be undertaken after mercifully having been spared a beating. We might therefore say that Tolstaya is parodying and subverting the 'paternalistic', even patriarchal, concept of a women's holiday and subverting the whole idea by spelling out the absurdity of it. In ridiculing the perpetrator's speech due contempt is shown.

[1] In the Introduction is included Tolstaya's account of an amusing incident involving a university lecturer and a similar error (Mal'gin 1988).

The translation on the other hand has normalised certain aspects of the text (there is a further element to this in that a reference to taking the washing 'there', i.e. 'to the well', and 'letting it soak' before washing it, is omitted. Possibly the translator felt that this was too demeaning an image of women to find favour among American female readers).

The few small nuances we have picked up in the translation of 'the decree' can be found replicated elsewhere in the novel and we can only suppose that this is a deliberate pattern, perhaps in a conscious attempt to preserve the politics of difference, as proposed by Luise von Flotow, who urges translators to take a bold stance in this direction:

> The purposes of this feminist work on language were multiple, yet two major objectives can be isolated, namely the deconstruction of 'patriarchal' language and the construction of a women's idiom. Deconstructive activity enabled women to flex their linguistic muscles and participate in the wrecking job on oppressive language; it enabled them to clear a space for the construction of new forms of language by and for women to 'give voice to' their different experiences, intuitions and knowledge (von Flotow 1997: 47).

In the original text women are referred to as *другая какая Пигалица*, with the latter word defined as colloquial for 'puny person', or possibly 'slip of a girl', but this is translated in a rather neutral manner as *Little Girls*, which removes any value judgements and therefore any offence to women and rather sanitises the original.

In the concluding remarks to her *Translation and Gender*, Luise von Flotow highlights the reductive nature of those approaches to translation which overlook the issue of difference:

> Theories that concern themselves with overarching abstractions about 'translatability', 'equivalence in difference' or 'dynamic equivalence' and view translation as a primarily linguistic operation carried out between two languages eschew the concrete issues of cultural difference, of context and of the discursive possibilities and options available at a specific historical moment (von Flotow 1997: 95).

It is however, still possible to remark that, although Gambrell's translation of *Kys'* does not actively intervene to oppose the marginalisation of 'the Other', it goes some way to assuage any possible perceived slight to women.

The last decree in *Кысь* runs as follows:

Указ Первый. *1. Начальник теперь буду я.* *2. Титло мое будет Генеральный Санитар.* *3. Жить буду в Красном Тереме с удвоенной охраной.* *4. На сто аршин не подходи, кто подойдет - сразу крюком без разговоров.* *Кудеяров* *Подскриптум:* *Город будет впредь и во веки веков зваться Кудеяр-Кудеярычск. Выучить накрепко.* *Кудеяров* (R: 352-353)	*DECREE NUMBER ONE* *1. I am going to be the Boss now.* *2. My title will be General Saniturion.* *3. I will live in the Red Terem with twice as many guards.* *4. Don't come any closer than one hundred yards, 'cause who-ever does will get the hook right away no questions asked.* *Kudeyarov* *PS.* *Henceforth and forever more the city will be called Kudeyar-Kudeyarichsk. Learn it by heart.* *Kudeyarov* (E: 256)

The paternalistic address, (replicated in all Kablukov's three decrees), is sharply dropped when Kudeiarich takes over. As can be seen above, his decree (the fourth in the book, after Kablukov's unfinished third version is crossed out) is worryingly abrupt, written in a declarative manner – 'I am going to be the Boss now'. In Russian word order the most important information goes at the end of the sentence (hence the last word is the 'new' and most important information) – in this case *я, (*ie 'I') – an emphatic construction often translated using a cleft sentence in English: 'I'm the one who's boss now', or 'It's me that's boss now' (colloquially). The whole piece continues in a no-nonsense dictatorial vein, emphasized by bureaucratic officialese and enumeration both of items and title. Imperatives too are used in order to signal the brutal authority of just who is in power. Again there is humour in the error of capitalization in the second word of the title.

A final feature of wordplay occurs in the postscript. At the end of the source text, 'Postscriptum' is distorted to read *Подскриптум* or 'Underscriptum', an example of

a foreign language being adopted and then purposely distorted to create humorous wordplay (Zemskaia 1983: 210) This, however, is simply translated into the target language as an abbreviated, but sullied, *PS*. A similar device of wordplay is used after the funeral scene:

- *Де мортибус аут бене аут нихиль! - гаркнул кто-то над ухом*. (R:131)
"De mortuis aut bene aut nihil!" someone cackled into Benedikt's ear (E:110)

Again, in the Russian version the distorted ablative case ending of *мортибус* in the Latin saying 'speak no ill of the dead' is corrected to the standard *mortuis* in English – perhaps because the translator has decided that English speakers more familiar with Latin would interpret the original version as a genuine mistake.

A final possible example of this translation strategy for exoticisms can be found at the very end of the book when Tolstaya concludes with a note of her travel destinations over the course of the novel (R:317), and mentions *Tiree*, in the Inner Hebrides in Scotland, correctly transliterated as *Тайри* in Russian. Perhaps in compensation for previous corrections, this exoticism is distorted to *Tyree* (E: 275)

1.5. Folklore and Fairytales in the Novel

As well as the more obvious instance of intertextuality in the novel, when Tolstaya quotes widely from Russian poetry (which she claims forms one strand of the individual's soul) and the extensive list of authors and works in Benedikt's library scene, (a parody of the Soviet *спецхран* ('spetskhran') or 'store of forbidden books') there is a further strand of intertextuality which brings echoes of folklore, ancient belief, suspicion and the fairytale to the novel. In many ways, this is the area which is most difficult for the translator, and the one in which she has been able to take most licence, substituting and inserting target language rhymes for the Russian versions. In some instances, this results in cultural loss in the translation and furthermore, a strange juxtaposition of obviously Western concepts, authors and terminology set within a novel firmly set in Moscow.

Будто лежит на юге лазоревое море, а на море на том - остров, а на острове - терем, а стоит в нем золотая лежанка. На лежанке девушка, один волос золотой, другой серебряный, один золотой, другой серебряный. Вот она свою косу расплетает, все расплетает, а как расплетет - тут и миру конец (R: 10)

They said that in the south there's an azure sea, and in that sea there's an island, and on that island there's a tower, and in that tower there's a golden stove bed. On that bed there's a girl with long hair-one hair is gold, the next is silver, one is gold, and the next is silver. She lies there braiding her tresses, just braiding her long tresses, and as soon as she finishes the world will come to an end (E: 5)

There are many folkloric and fairy-tale elements in Tolstaya's novel, and constant allusions to customs and beliefs, traditions and superstitions, jokes and puns which have traditional Russian culture at its roots. In the character of Benedikt we may recognise the naïve and sympathetic character of the fairy tale hero Ivan the Fool, leading us to expect a fairy tale structure which would include the hero's journey of adventure during which he would meet and marry a fair maiden, all to conclude with a happy ending. Indeed, turning to the fairy tale plot as outlined by the Russian structuralist Vladimir Propp (1969:119-127) we can trace a subverted version in Tolstaya's novel.

In Propp's analysis the fairytale begins with the background and physical description of the hero, to be followed by his departure from his parents' house, prompted by some evil misdeed. The hero undertakes a journey, successfully completes a series of tests, aided by a magic helper. The hero arrives at the court of a mighty King, becomes his helper, undertakes further successful adventures, punishes the villain and returns home, having married his princess and establishing his right to the throne.

We can recognise some elements of this outline in *Кысь* in that Benedikt becomes an orphan, leaves home to marry Olen'ka, the daughter of the Head of the State Safety Secretariat. He leaves to the luxurious dwelling of his in-laws and is recruited to help his father-in-law enforce the State prohibition on books. In the figure of the father-in-law with his magical ability to cast light with his eyes, we may see the figure of the 'magic helper'. Instead, however, of emerging victorious from his trials, Benedikt

succeeds in four killings, clumsily and fatally wounding two fellow *golubchiks* with his hook during book raids, clumsily falling on the sick Varvara Lukinishna, and finally dispatching the Great Murza Fedor Kuz'mich himself – again done clumsily, with his hook. Perhaps parodying the lack of humanity of life in a totalitarian State, each murder is accompanied by a wry comment.

After a scene in which Benedikt is looking for a book and using his legs to grapple with a box lid under Varvara's bed, he takes Varvara's hand for support. Interpreting his increasing breathlessness and agitation as a sign of his frustrated love she wonders out loud, 'You're equally distraught? Dear heart! Could it be … is it true? …' These prove to be her last words, when in a wonderful display of tragi-comedy, Benedikt suffers cramp, falls and lurches towards her. Upon realising she is dead he calls for help from Teterya Petrovich, who helpfully offers that 'you're supposed to call people together, rustle up a lot of grub, bliny and stuff, and to make sure there's a shitload of booze.' (E: 215)

Similarly when Konstantin Leont'ich is killed by Benedikt's hook, the narrator comments wryly that he won't be missed at the headcount because he had been 'taken for treatment' (ibid: 239).

When finally the dictator Fedor Kuz'mich himself is killed, Tolstaya again uses bathos to underline the vulnerability and humanity common to all while alluding to traditional ritual in the face of evil:

> *Лопнуло что-то; звук такой тихий, но отчетливый; на крюке напряглось и обмякло […] Тельце чахленькое, а сколько возни было. Бенедикт сдвинул колпак, обтер рукавом нос […] Тесть подошел, тоже посмотрел. Головой покачал.*
> *- Крюк-то запачкамши. Прокипятить придется.* (R: 349)

> *Something burst. It was a soft sound, but distinct. Something tensed and then went limp on the hook. […] So much fuss and bother for such a puny little body. Benedikt pushed back his hood and wiped his nose with his sleeve*[1] […] *father-in-law walked over and looked. He shook his head.*

[1]Benedikt's actions may be construed as part of the ritual of *смахивание* or "wiping away", when evil is wiped away with a wet rag (Conrad: 425)

"The hook got dirty. It'll have to be boiled."[1] (E: 253)

In all four murders, Benedikt has been shown to be an anti-hero, a failure and the antithesis, or subverted version, of Ivan the Fool.

In a further example we see reference being made to the practice of *выкуривание* or 'smoking out' when a room of a sick person is fumigated to clear away any evil spirit.

> *Всю пакостину извели, в курятнике березовым дымом помахали, чтоб снова не завелось нехорошего, и Гогу Юродивого приводили, чтоб заговор наложил: на четыре угла, на четыре двора, с-под моря зеленого, с-под дуба паленого, с-под камня горючего, с-под козла вонючего; тай, тай, налетай, направо дую, налево плюю, айн, цвай, драй. Заговор крепкий, проверенный, должно держаться* (R: 42)

> *We got rid of the whole foul flock, cleared the coop with birch smoke so nothing evil would sprout up, and brought Goga the Fool to cast a spell: North, south, east, west, under the green sea, under the flaming oak, under the hot stone, under the stinking goat -hey, hey, fly away fly; blow left, spit right, eins, zwei, drei. It's a strong spell, tried and true, it should last* (E: 28)

The reference is clear from the translation although it is curious to note that Gambrell corrects Goga the Holy Fool's rendition of 'ein' for 'eins'. The fact that Goga is merely referred to as 'the Fool' means that the reader is denied any knowledge of Russian traditional belief in the figure of the *Юродивыи* or 'God's Fool', who is indeed an idiot, but an idiot believed to possess the divine gift of prophecy.

The adventure of Benedikt's journey is further soured by the fact that, although he wins his princess, they do not live happily ever after, as his beautiful wife grows plump, loses her sparkle and is attracted to the charms of the former mutant Terenty Petrovich – 'did your dung heap Terenty Petrovich drop in on your wife, the bootlicker, mocker, helpful wheeler-dealer? Did his lewd, empty talk burble through

---

[1] Likewise, the boiling of the hook can be construed as the ritual of *смывание* or "washing away' of evil.

the rooms? Did he tempt with wondrous marvels?'[1] (E: 225) Again we see Tolstaya playfully subverting the fairytale motif of the *красная девица* or 'fair maiden', when Olga turns into the antithesis of the latter, becoming a creature with rolls of fat and matted hair.

When Benedikt asks an old Chechen 'Grandfather have you ever seen the Slynx?" (E: 8), we are told that that everyone stares at him as if he's mad, and no one speaks. This may leave the reader rather confused, referring as it does to the fact that the mythical creature known as *Кысь* can be seen as analogous to the devil. Since the devil has the ability to change his shape, he can appear 'as a human being, a black cat, black dog, pig, horse, snake, wolf, hare, mouse, frog and magpie, and even as a ball of thread or a pile of hay' (Oinas: 99). In fact, folk belief stipulates that it is dangerous to mention the devil by name, lest he appear immediately, to the detriment of the speaker (ibid: 98). Again, Tolstaya is illustrating the traditions and customs of the *golubchiks* in Fedor Kuz'michsk[2], thus likening their life to that of the old days. Without the aid of paratext in the English translation the English reader is left puzzled and knowledge of traditional Russian superstitions is lost.

In this way, the novel functions on two levels - on the surface level the novel may be seen as a satire, underlining the absurdities and sadnesses of life in a totalitarian State through the use of irony, parody and other satiric devices. On a deeper level however, we can see that in the many allusions to the familiar world of Russian

---

[1] Tolstaya may be parodying those in Soviet society who grew rich and influential through ingratiation after the break-up of the Soviet Union.

[2] The name of the town which was formerly Moscow is itself interesting, parodying as it does the Soviet habit of re-naming towns after political leaders (e.g. Leningrad, Stalingrad). The name consists of the name of the 'Great Murza' with the suffix '-sk' reserved for naming Soviet towns (e.g. 'Magnitogorsk').

The name however will have further resonance to Russian readers who will recall L'ev Tolstoy's short story entitled 'Fedor Kuz'mich' (1905). In his introduction to his translation, Aylmer Maude wrote that 'the story is based on the rumour that the Emperor Alexander 1 did not die in 1825, as the history books say, but lived as a hermit in Siberia until he was over ninety […]. In 1927 the Soviet Government had the Imperial tombs opened and that of Alexander I was found to contain nothing but a bar of lead. On May 29th 1929, *The Times* published further information pointing in the same direction. Basilevskii, formerly a rich mine-owner in Siberia, had then recently died at the age of ninety and his diary revealed the fact that he had been told by a merchant named Khromov […] that a certain *Starets*, Fedor Kuz'mich, had lived on the estate and when dying had informed Khromov that he was the Tsar Alexander I' (Maude, A. in Tolstoy 1934: xxi-xxii).

folkore and fairy tales, in the idea of memory as a means of spiritual enlightenment, lend the novel its soubriquet as an 'encyclopaedia of Russian life' (Paramonov: 2000) Tolstaya captures the idea that folklore continues to have an influence on the speech, behaviour and thinking of ordinary people and uses it to critique in a postmodern manner the appropriation of folklore in Soviet society for communist propaganda.[1]

A further example of domestication in translation, with the result of cultural loss, can be found in instances where magic or ritual is conjured up. In the Russian text Benedikt muses over the reaction of his co-workers when someone is late arriving at work. We are told how people start whispering and exchanging glances, wondering whether the worker has fallen ill:

> *Хорошо, что не опоздал. Опоздать-то оно ничего, да пойдут переглядывания да перешептывания: а не заболел ли, Боже упаси, Боже упаси? Тьфу, тьфу, тьфу,* ***не сглазить бы*** (R: 37-38)
>
> Good that he wasn't late. Being late doesn't matter, but people start to look and whisper: has he fallen ill, God forbid, God forbid. Knock on wood. (E: 25)

---

[1] Felix Oinas (1984:134-135) provides background: 'The belief that folklore reflected the ideology of the ruling classes gave rise to a strongly negative attitude to it in literary circles in the 1920s. The so-called *Proletcul't* (Proletarian Cultural and Educational Organizations) declared that folklore was hostile to Soviet people, because it reflected the *kulak* ("rich farmers") ideology. Numerous *Proletcul't* leaders called for the annihilation of folklore. A special *Children's Proletcul't* sought to eradicate folktales on the basis that they glorified tsars and tsareviches, corrupted and instigated sickly fantasies in children, developed the *kulak* attitude, and strengthened bourgeois ideals […] the early post-revolutionary detractors of folklore were also enemies of classical Russian literature. This nihilistic attitude culminated in Vladimir Maiakovskij's ecstatic cry, "We are shooting the old generals! Why not Pushkin?"'.

Later, after an appeal for folklore by Maksim Gor'kii at the First Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934, folklore in the Soviet Union was 'used consciously for propagating the cultural construction and political education of the masses for one goal – the realization of socialism and communism […] folklorists were required to keep a critical attitude toward the folklore material they encountered, since not all of it by any means warranted recording […] the ideologically unacceptable folklore included thieves' and hooligans songs and the "cruel romances" of the bourgeois type" and was usually performed and transmitted in streets and other places during "unorganised rest." In order to avoid this kind of interaction, care was taken that positive Soviet folklore would be created and diffused in an orderly manner: during organized collective rest or in the course of various cultural events in clubs, houses of culture, reading huts, and at meetings of amateur circles' (ibid: 136-137).

In European Russia, a common activity of witches was to put *сглаз* (the Evil Eye) on babies, young animals and crops. In adults, the Evil Eye is routinely thought to be the cause of migraine headaches and sleepless nights. Conjurers with the ability to invoke the Evil Eye are regularly blamed for babies' colic, for the death of young animals, for the shrivelling of fruit trees and even the failure of entire crops (Conrad: 424). Clearly Tolstaya is demonstrating the primitive, suspicious beliefs still prevailing among the *golubchiks* when she depicts them 'knocking three times' in order to ward off the ***сглаз*** (Evil Eye):- "**не сглазить бы**" an imperative infinitive here used to suggest 'let not the Evil Eye be cast'. In English, the onomatopoeic value and immediacy of *Тьфу, тьфу, тьфу*, usually translated as *Phooey!* or *Pah!* (showing contempt and irritation), is omitted and there is no suggesting of the occult. In fact, 'knock on wood' (USA) or 'touch wood' (Br) is merely used as a failsafe expression to ward off anything unpleasant after making a confident statement predicting success. That is not the case here, and the problem facing the translator is that the word *Тьфу* suggests contempt precisely because it is both onomatopoeic and represents mimetically the sound made when someone spits (Ozhegov:1978).

Here the syntactic formulae used suggest a traditional Russian oral charm, essentially forming an emphatic command.

According to Conrad (1989:425) traditional Russian charms have a basically bipartite structure in that they state the problem and the remedy. They may consist of (1) a short introductory Christian invocation: *Боже упаси, Боже упаси*, (2) an expository section: *не заболел ли* describing the disease or problem and (3) a closing expulsion formula: *Тьфу, тьфу, тьфу, не сглазить бы*. Likewise magic numbers, such as three, are used to increase the power of a given charm in proportion to the frequency of their occurrence (ibid: 427). Therefore the full effect of the charm formula is imperative - to ward off evil-doing and the effect of spitting three times is to triple this charm's magic power, followed by a command that any potential evil-doing cease – 'cast not the Evil Eye!' The English translation captures none of the magic, incantatory effect.

Another example is of a rhyme, an incantation to remove a sty from an eye:

Ячмень-ячмень,
Жичинка-жичинка,

Кукиш-кукиш.
На кукиш ничего не купишь.
Купишь топорок,
Разрубишь жичинку поперек. (R: 38)

Gloss:

Sty, Sty
Little grain, Little grain
A *kukish,* a *kukish,* is what you are
You won't pay anything for a *kukish*[1]
But you can buy yourself a little axe
And then you'll cleave that grain in half

Sty, sty,
Fly out of my eye.
Strap, strap,
Don't fall in the trap.
Fig, fig,
You'll ne'er buy a pig.
Buy an ax and laugh
Chop the strap in half. (E: 25)

The original rhyme in Russian alludes to the use of 'imitative magic'(in which a sty on the eye may be addressed as *ячмень* (barley)) in a ritual designed to cure the condition, referred to as *выклевывание* or 'pecking out'. In one variant one or more grains of barley are given to the person with the sty and then are given to a hen or cock to eat. When the grains disappear, so should the sty disappear (Conrad: 425). Here the playful original charm follows this formula, suggesting splitting a whole grain with an axe, after which *И вот как рукой его снимет, ячмень-то этот* 'it will be as if a hand has taken it away, that sty there'. In the English version we are simply urged to 'chop a strap in half', whereupon 'That sty will go right away.' (E: 25). This is an important difference as the lack of reference to folklore and ancient magic ritual represents a significant cultural loss in the English version.

[1] *kukish*: a gesture of defiance and contempt, made by protruding the thumb between the index and middle fingers and extending the clenched fist.

1.6. Science Fiction

The distinguishing feature of science fiction is that the world in which the fiction is set is noticeably strange or discontinuous from life as we know it. Other forms of fiction will include strangeness of character(s) or narrative, but only if the structure of the setting for the narration contains innovation(s) does the work class as science fiction. Often the genre includes a confrontation between the world to which we are accustomed and a strange alternative, an obvious example being an invasion from outer space as in H. G. Wells's *War of the Worlds* (1898). A popular complement to this scenario is a visit by earthlings to other worlds, a concept again explored by Wells in *The Martian Chronicles* (1901). Although plots involving travel to strange places are usually projected into the future, this was not always the case. However, works such as Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Lost World* (1912) would no longer be credible as the Earth is to all extents fully explored. Future worlds form the basis of much science fiction writing, some of the most famous being dystopian visions such as Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell's *1984* (1949).

McHale (1987) derives a link between modernist fiction and detective stories, extending it to connect postmodernist fiction to science fiction. The former link is based on McHale's assertion that the dominant (the focussing component) of modernist fiction relates to knowledge, 'What is there to be known? Who knows it? How do they know it, and with what degree of certainty?' (ibid: 9), leading to the popular detective thriller being seen as its "sister-genre". For McHale, 'science fiction, like postmodernist fiction, is governed by the ontological dominant … we can think of science fiction as postmodernism's non-canonized or "low art" double' (ibid: 59). The questions to be asked of both fictions are 'Which world is this? What is to be done in it?'(ibid: 10).

Even if postmodernistic fiction and science fiction bow to the same dominant, they have advanced independently, although there is evidence of ideas from science fiction being introduced into postmodernistic fiction: McHale cites the example of the 'gadgetry' beloved of science fiction being introduced in the writings of Burroughs and DeLillo (ibid: 66). However, 'in general […] postmodernistic writers are more

interested in the social and institutional consequences of technological innovation […] most postmodernist futures are grim dystopias […] the motif of a world after the holocaust or some apocalyptic breakdown recurs' (ibid: 67). There is a clear convergence in the popularity of dystopian visions in both genres, although 'postmodernist worlds of the future typically employ the "zero degree" of temporal displacement, projecting a future time but without making any particular provision for bridging the temporal gap between present and future; that bridge is left for the reader to build' (ibid: 67).

According to Stites (1992) Soviet science fiction, sometimes called 'the folklore of the Scientific Technical Revolution' was immensely popular both during the Brezhnev years and in the 1980s, with demand always outstripping supply – 'Like all popular culture of the era, science fiction aimed its critical barbs at flaws in the system, including low scientific literacy and bureaucratic conservatism, but not at the system itself. (Stites:153). In particular Stites singles out Vladimir Savchenko's *Алгоритм успеха* (Success Algorithm) (1964) as a 'manual for making it to the top through manipulation, betrayal, venality and false deference'(ibid). Tolstaya herself claims no such political motives in producing her dystopian fantasy.

1.7. Dystopian Influences on *Кысь*.

Tolstaya employs science fiction, in particular the sub-genre of dystopia, in which to set her novel, although, as has been previously noted, this genre of novel did not generally find favour with critics, who considered it old-fashioned, no longer fresh and more in tune with the literature of the end of the eighties[1]. Others have pointed variously to Zamiatin's *Мы* (We)[2], a dystopian satire on totalitarian society (written as

[1] See (Ivanova 2001).

[2]Peter Cavendish comments that 'the growing cult of the machine among proletarian poets, Constructivists and Futurists, as well as his interest in the science-fiction novels of H. G. Wells, gave rise to *We*, a dazzling but ultimately over-formulaic expression of his fears regarding a technological, collectivised future' (Cavendish P. in Cornwell (ed):911).

early as 1920/1, unpublished in the Soviet Union until 1988/89)[1], and Vladimir Voinovich's *Москва 2042* (Moscow 2042) (1986)[2] as influences.

Carden points out that Zamiatin's novel, however, does not in itself paint a picture of the breakdown of order and civil war, the material reality of life in the 1920s, instead offering the peace and order of life in the *One State* and in this respect it can be difficult to distinguish Zamiatin's targets in *We* (Carden 1987: 2). The view of the critic Edward Brown is that:

> Zamiatin's rebellion … is not directed against any particular version of the modern mass society. It is not directed at socialism or Communism as such but rather at forms of the regimentation which has resulted from the growth of a huge and complex industrial civilization (Brown 1963:73).

The critic Nikita Eliseev (2000) goes farther back in time and suggests Tolstaya's novel exhibits the influence of Mikhail Saltykov-Schedrin's satirical novel *История одного города* (The History of a Town) (1869-70)[3], whereas for Andrei Nemzer (2000) the influence of the fantastic in the works of Aleksei Remizov (1877-1957) and the science fiction of the Strugatskii brothers, Arkadii (1925-1991) and Boris (1933-), is evident.

---

[1]In his introduction to his translation of *We*, Mirra Ginsburg writes 'Zamiatin was a consistent enemy of all canonized ideas, all coercion, all the purveyors of "compulsory salvation." He mercilessly attacked and ridiculed the emerging totalitarianism, its fawning mediocrities, its reign of brutality, its violation and destruction of the free and creative human spirit. He foresaw it all: the terror, the betrayals, the dehumanisation; the ubiquitous "guardians"; the control of thought and action; the constant brainwashing which resulted either in unquestioning automatons or in hypocrites who lied for the sake of survival; the demand that everybody worship the Benefactor, with his huge hand that literally "liquidates", reduces all who dissent, all who passionately want to be themselves to a puddle of clear water. He also foresaw the subjection of the arts. […] And not only must the people ("numbers") in this apocalyptic state of ritualised totalitarianism attend the gala ceremony of extermination of every heretic by the Benefactor, but a poet is obliged to recite an ode celebrating the wisdom and great justice of the executioner.' (Ginsburg, M. in Zamiatin 1972: xiii-xiv).

[2]In this novel Voinovich's hero, Kartsev, is an expatriate writer living in Germany who learns that the airline *Lufthansa* are offering clandestine time travel, whereupon he sets off for a Russia 60 years hence to a Moscow presided over by a communist *Great Genialissimo*. (A. McMillin in Cornwell, (ed.) 1998: 884).

[3]A satire mocking the town of *Glupov* ('Stupidtown'), symbolizing Russia and its tyrannically inept administration. Twenty-one governors preside over the much beaten and highly taxed *Glupovites*. The penultimate of these governors – Ugrium Burcheev – forces the *Glupovites* to destroy their town and reconstruct it as a military camp (Foote, I P in Cornwell (ed): 709).

Critics have inevitably commented on parallels with anti-utopian novels such as Orwell's '1984' (1949) in which the degradation of Winston Smith at the hands of the 'Thought Police' within the totalitarian State of 'Oceania' is detailed. Also cited is Huxley's 'Brave New World' (1932) where people live in a post-apocalypse 'World State' and take the narcotic *soma* to induce happiness. A third possible allusion widely remarked upon by Russian critics is the futuristic novel 'Fahrenheit 451' by the American author Ray Bradbury (1953). In the latter the main protagonist is the fireman, Guy Montag, whose job entails enforcing a ban on books by destroying them through burning, Bradbury acknowledging the perniciousness of McCarthyist censorship as inspiration.[1]

Although it is appropriate to set out such utopian and anti-utopian works as a literary and cultural background which may have framed Tolstaya's novel, it is not the intention here to identify sources or writers of science fiction who may have directly influenced Tolstaya's work, but rather to bring into relief the confrontation of ideas which may have led to its composition. In an interview with the *Moscow News* newspaper the author herself states that she was only partly inspired to write the novel by the events of the Chernobyl' explosion:

> I would like to get away from that precise association. Everyone has their explosions, their cataclysms, wars and the downfall of the worlds they've grown used to. What about the year 1917? There has never been anything worse than that in our history. And it's dreadful to guess at what's still to come. (Tolstaya and Tolstaya 2001:342 trans. LCK)

According to Natalia Olshanskaia, the literary genre of anti-utopia or "dystopia" came into prominence in the first half of the twentieth century as a reaction to the

---

[1] Bradbury's novel was translated into Russian in 1965 and somewhat ironically held up as a commentary on the repression of free will deemed to be then prevalent in the USA. In the preface to the Russian edition, R Nudel'man writes: 'In the novella *Fahrenheit 451*, Bradbury has, as it were, projected the contemporary USA into the future and shown us a world bereft of creativity and creation, has shown us its technology adapted solely for the stuffing full of stomachs and making a fool of minds, to gain riches from the hunger of millions and to threaten billions with atomic death. This is a world in which firemen set books on fire, for the most dangerous thing to the existence of this world is free feelings and free thought […] Thus feelings, knowledge, beauty and culture gradually disappear from life, making way for estrangement, cruelty and indifference' (Nudel'man in Bradbury 1965: 8-9).

utopian novels of earlier times: 'Demonstrating how utopian strivings usually lead to violence and despotism, anti-utopia functions as a grotesque inversion of utopia. The authors of anti-utopias envisage societies of the future as dominated by a tyrannical idea, which violates the rules of traditional social developments, as well as the moral and psychological norms of individual behaviour' (Olshanskaia 2000:426). Olshanskaia quotes Aldous Huxley, author of *Brave New* World, protesting in one of his letters[1] that the obsession with a "better future" could lead to neglecting the present:

> The moment you get a religion which thinks primarily about the bigger and better future – as do all the political religions from Communism to Nazism up to the at present, harmless, because unorganised and powerless, forms of Humanism and Utopianism – it runs the risk of becoming ruthless, of liquidating the people it happens to find inconvenient now for the sake of the people who are going, hypothetically, to be so much better and happier and more intelligent in the year 2000 (Huxley 1969: 483).

This chimes well with Tolstaya's response when asked in the same *Moscow News* interview whether she wished to demonstrate by her novel what the future held: she replies:

> No. Our eternal present. It is true that when you write an anti-utopian novel it is somehow inevitable interpreted as a political satire, but I didn't intend that. I wanted to write about life and about the people. About the enigmatic Russian people. That is a secret which is purer than the pyramid of Cheops. Be you an ordinary bloke or Authority – there's no difference (Tolstaya and Tostaya 2002: 342trans. LCK).

She strongly denies too that references in the novel are making political comment:

> I think that sentence was true of the Russia of Catherine the Great, too. And of the whole of Russian history. In former times the peasants were flogged, then it was decided that this was unnecessary. Formerly, fortresses were built – but now, take a stroll, its quite possible. Up until Alexander's reforms justice was according to class – afterwards everyone was equal before the law. Now you couldn't have relatives abroad – now, do so to your heart's content. Now private property is a bad thing – now

[1] To Julian Huxley, 23 November 1942

> you can have it again. But in Europe, let's say, from those times as it ceased to be acceptable to 'put in the knife' it is now no longer done, whereas in our country they are still striving to revert to it. I really wanted to take out or keep to the minimum all political allusions. I changed and discarded whole chunks of text in order not to give ground to those sort of cheap nod-and-a-wink comments when they say 'this is about so-and-so and what he's done' (ibid: 344-5).

Elsewhere, the influence of Vladimir Nabokov's surreal novel *Приглашение на казнь* (Invitation to a Beheading) (1935/6) is remarked upon most frequently by Russian critics (and not at all by American critics). In this novel of the fantastic, the despair of the main character, Cincinnatus C, is depicted as he is condemned to death for the crime of 'gnostic turpitude' and imprisoned, at first alone and later with his tyrannical executioner. The novel was written by Nabokov fifteen years after escaping the Bolshevist regime and just before the Nazi regime 'reached its full volume of welcome', as related in his foreword to the English language edition (Nabokov 1963: 7). The two novels clearly share the theme of hatred of repression but the most interesting similarity is to be found in the surreal nature of their respective endings. In Nabokov's novel, scenes of realism at the execution - such as when the executioner puts on a white apron 'from under which his jackboot showed' (ibid: 189), or Cincinnatus lies down at the gallows as he had been shown, 'but at once he covered the back of his neck with his hands' (ibid: 190) - are interspersed with those of high fantasy. When Cincinnatus seemingly stands up the executioner's 'still swinging hips' are visible and a pale librarian can be seen 'doubled up, vomiting' suggesting the execution has taken place, after which we read the conclusion:

> Everything was coming apart. Everything was falling. A spinning wind was picking up and whirling: dust, rags, chips of painted wood, bits of gilded plaster, pasteboard bricks, posters; an arid gloom fleeted; and amidst the dust, and the falling things, and the flapping scenery, Cincinnatus made his way in that direction where, to judge by the voices, stood beings akin to him (ibid: 191)

In *Кысь*, the reader can discern the same denial of the triumph of evil when Tolstaya paints the picture of the burning at stake of the *Прежний* ('Former One' or 'Oldener'), Nikita Ivanovich. A comic mocking realism pervades in the careful

description of Benedikt's wife and mother-in-law attending in their summer carriages 'under lace parasols, all fancy and so fat the axles had bowed under them and the wheels were turning into squares' (Tolstaya 2003a: 271). Similarly when Nikita Ivanovich takes time to correct the crowd's distorted pronunciation of the word 'gasoline' (ibid: 272), Benedikt reacts by asking him what possible difference it can make now? Even at this moment of high drama the old stoker angrily muses that it 'surely can't be that difficult to "assimilate orthoepy"' (ibid.), thus literally underlining the superiority of 'correct pronunciation' over non-normative speech.

At the conclusion of the novel, when Nikita Ivanovich wrests control of the situation by igniting the fire himself, here too the element of the fantastic takes over and the 'Former One' emerges alive, linking hands with another 'Former One' (Lev L'vovich), the two of them starting to rise up into the air. Tolstaya is here playing with a variety of styles, realist and fantastic, employing *quotational* and other meaningful references to other texts which will be understood by the informed reader.

The use of intertextuality is further reinforced by the final epilogue of the short verse by Natalia Vasil'evna Krandievskaia, Tolstaya's grandmother, which also mirrors Nabokov's vision of a spirit 'rising up', and a 'wilful' wind , chasing the 'ashes' left in its wake:

> O joyless, painless moment!
> The spirit rises, beggarly and bright,
> A stubborn wind blows hard, and hastens
> The cooling ash that follows it in flight (ibid: 275)

The Former Ones, as did Cincinnatus C, triumphed over repression, but when Benedikt asks whether they really are alive, the answer is 'Figure it out as best you can!' (ibid.) The conclusion is left 'open' and readers too must put their own interpretations on it – the postmodern text 'has in effect no boundaries: its interest in context is so great that it is very difficult to understand where the "work" concludes and the "situation" begins. Perhaps the ascension merely suggests the possibility of spiritual growth imbuing the participants with religious or angel-like status. Or it may signal abandonment, since there is no possibility to progress northwards (too

many thick forests), southwards (the Chechens live there) or to the West (where the forests are light and there are tasty 'firelings') – but love of Russia precludes this.

Thus we are reminded that 'The "centre of gravity" of the text […] is more and more frequently situated beyond the bounds of the text' (Kuritsyn 2001:38).

1.8. Dystopian? Anti-Utopian? The Critics have their Say.

Referring to the explosion of Chernobyl in 1986, the critic Galina Nefagina reminds us that 'the second half of the eighties was a very complex time. As the history of literature shows it is in precisely such times that feelings of approaching catastrophe or a sensation of the consequences of revolutionary changes especially serve to activate the genre of dystopia [1]. 1989 brought us for the first time the "Unreturned" of A Kabakov and "The New Robinsons" of L. Petrushevskaia […]. The convention of the fantastic, which forms the basis of the anti-utopia, hyperbolising and in that way uncovering general tendencies, brings to it a fulfilling sense of volume' (Nefagina 2002:185-6 trans. LCK).

It must also be noted that several critics did take the view that *Кысь* was not in fact an anti-utopian novel, but in fact a parody of an anti-utopian novel. The critic Natal'ia Ivanova tells us:

> When it came out the newspaper critics pronounced *Кысь* to be anti-utopian. But if it really is an anti-utopian novel, popular at the end of the 80's, then Tolstaya has, shall we say, missed the boat and gone out of fashion as today the anti-utopian novel is not topical in the literary sense.
>
> I don't know, I just don't know: for my own part, as a writer myself, overcoming the strength of the material and choosing the genre either makes it relevant to today, or buries it. Tolstaya is not writing a routine anti-utopian novel but a parody of one. A

[1] Nefagina points out that the literary critic M. Chudakova referred to this time as a "historical disaster"; Nefagina continues 'at the end of the 20th century anti-utopia turns its attention not only to the purely social utopias of mankind. In contemporary society there are quite a few tendencies which threaten the moral life of man, and sometimes the life of the earth in general. Although, one way or the other, a social problem lies at the base of all negative instances, however some kinds of tendencies can manifest themselves more openly and keenly' (Nefagina 2002:185-6).

> Device not in the Irten sense, but in the Tynyanov sense. She has combined an 'intellectual' anti-utopian novel (the consequences of the Explosion reach from the well-known American film 'On the Beach', to 'The Last Pastoral' by Aleksei Adamovich) with Russian folklore and with the fairytale; she has combined "science-fiction" (which has as a popular theme an explosion casting a land into the Middle Ages) with a red-hot newspaper satire; that is to say the literature of the masses with an elite, refined prose. She has combined these things and then pepped things up a bit more. In what way? With disappointment, scepticism, bitterness. With the ashes of unrealised illusions, hopes and dreams. With sorrow for that which has been lost little by little. […] It is that tension too (between the sorrow and rage of its intrinsic message and the contrived design of its execution) which makes Tolstaya's novel a special word within new Russian prose. (Ivanova 2001 trans. LCK).

For Alexandr Ageev, Tolstaya's novel is not at all dystopian, but has emerged rather because 'the influence of long experience of writing satirical articles for periodicals' has taken its toll. He cites some of the articles out of which the novel can be seen to have grown:

> Occupying a basic role is of course the article 'Russian World', already written by 1993 for the "Guardian" newspaper. A cruel article, dense, with its Russophobic concentration, with which it is pointless either to agree or to dispute, inasmuch as it is pure artistry:
>
> > "That is from your point of view, from the point of view of an observer on the sidelines. Russia crept forth from ocean to ocean, while you with your linear, straight Western logic believe in the directions of light, in the rose bush of the winds, in atmospheric pressure in miles and kilometres. But from the Russian point of view we are HERE. We may go a thousand miles away and again we will be HERE. We don't believe in arithmetic. Where we are – that's where HERE is. So, isn't all the same where? It's pointless to talk of stagnation, for we are living NOW, and stagnation is a process and we do not understand processes. It is pointless to speak of destruction - about the razing of some beautiful cathedral or other. YESTERDAY it existed – TODAY it does not. But then of course the converse is possible: TODAY there is nothing, but YESTERDAY it existed. But THE DAY BEFORE YESTERDAY it again did not exist. It has come to pass that THE DAY BEFORE YESTERDAY nothing is

> at all different from TODAY and YESTERDAY is a capricious splash of a wave, gurgling then gone. Perhaps it will gurgle again."

> Apart from "Russian World" the articles "Golden Age" and "On a False Leg" have been tossed into this 'Irish Stew'. 'Golden Age' is a staggering review for the American press of Elena Molokhovets's cookery book – there are about a dozen pages of *Кысь* taken from this, connected with food and the 'national manner' of 'supping' in general. In "On a False Leg" we are dealing with the love of modern-day Russians for one-syllable words, which is why as you are reading this article your head is thumping with *День*, *Ночь*, *Кысь* [Day, Night, Slynx].
>
> *Кысь* is not a "utopian novel", nor an "anti-utopian novel" and still yet not a "dystopian novel" as it has been customary to begin saying, and not even "a novel of topical satire" as I first thought, but is nothing more than an essay – an unsuccessful essay, because it is long, dull with a great deal of not very committed literary shortcomings (Ageev 2001 trans.LCK).

The critic Viacheslav Kuritsyn makes no reference to the genre of anti-utopia at all – preferring to see in Benedikt's adventures a wonderful plot for a parable – that of the 'little man' on the icy winds of existence:

> Russian melancholia and depression delineated with enormously piercing clarity [...] but then something in the novel breaks down. The fact of the matter is this: that the anti-logocentric idea has exhausted its creative potential, so to speak, having spawned some impassioned articles and several pages from Sorokin. It's hard to believe that Tolstaya's work is propounding this concept, but …
>
> When ideology enters the novel, the fairytale sorrow and anguish disappear and a satirical article begins. When the dissidents come into view of the reader then we have caricature. The new ruler writes Decrees – we have a pamphlet. Allusions abound like *ржавь* (even the Kremlin 'family' gets a tick, or so it would seem …). And an exhausted author stops throwing fresh coal into the furnace of language. The ending goes like this: two culinary dissidents say "let's soar away, friend!" and away they soar. Up into the sky. But that's more of a dinner-table anecdote than the ending of a Great Novel, isn't it: Tolstaya doesn't so much conquer logocentrism as emphasise how strongly we are in its grip (Kuritsyn 2000 trans LCK).

Mark Lipovetsky, whilst agreeing with others that Tolstaya has indeed created a encyclopaedia of Russia, a very real model of Russian history and culture, takes the view that the model is not a historical one, but:

> rather a metaphysical or even scientific one. Russia as a self-perpetuating process, like perpetual motion along a closed circle. […] Drawing this picture, Tolstaya is not forecasting the future (therefore *Кысь* is not in any way anti-utopian) but she brilliantly conveys the present-day crisis of language, the present-day collapse of hierarchical relationships in culture – when the cultural regimes of Soviet civilisation tumbled down, burying at the same time the alternative anti-Soviet cultural hierarchies too. And those orders which are organised for a consciousness not touched by the radiation of the Soviet experience also sound the same as the lectures of the Former Peoples in Tolstaya's novel – probable, logical but completely incomprehensible, and surely not at all about us. The principal similarity is in the fact that in that view of culture emerging in Russia in the 1990s, as in the consciousness of Tolstaya's protagonist Benedikt, there is no history […] And in our country there is only one historical landmark – The Explosion which separated the whole time into 'before' and 'after'. And in this case it is of no significance how long the explosion lasted, seconds or 70 years. It essentially abolished time and history, having made oblivion the only form of cultural succession (Lipovetsky 2001 trans.LCK).

For Dimitrii Ol'shanskii once again the novel is not to be perceived as anti-utopian, but as 'an encyclopaedia of Russian life':

> Tatyana Tolstaya's novel […] has the air of the anti-utopian, but is in fact an out-and-out encyclopaedia of Russian life. The plot is the history of Ancient *Русь*, as it emerged amid the poisoned debris of Moscow in an unspecified year, clearly conjured up by Chernobyl – *Кысь* was begun in 1986. Nonetheless, this move to the traditional Fantastic is nothing other than the method of the so-called defamiliarisation, an opportunity to look at all the "great, coarse and heavy truth" that is Russian life from afar, as it were. The result has turned out to be grandiose.
>
> In the end Tatyana Tolstaya lends that specifically Russian, tender and sincere note to the nightmare she describes. Any national myth is enmeshed in the population, but only in Russia does that population give back a sort of wondrous kindness (Ol'shanskii 2000 trans. LCK).

Karen Stepanian is perhaps one of the critics to express his distaste for Tolstaya's novel, blaming the fact that 'the point of view of the author has changed towards her characters from that of her earlier work' and objecting to her sarcastic, quasi-religious description of working for the government, and, it would seem by extension, mockery of those who do so:

> … she has begun to observe her characters from the outside, they have become for her an object, an object of irony. This is the source of the 'cerebral' structure of her anti-utopia (both in its design and structure: the lay-out of the whole text is done with chapters having symbolic titles in the order of the letters of the old Russian alphabet […] and a cold sneering at the familiar or typecast individuals, situations, depictions of native history and the insipid, at times even blazing language, blazing with the sparkling reminders of its former glory […] 'agriculture is work for everyone's hands'; 'that's when you feel that government service is the same as that, that same strength and glory and earthly power, for ever and ever, amen'. Perhaps some people find that funny, but I don't.
>
> Whatever the reason for it – the harmful influence of long experience of writing satirical articles for periodicals (read with pleasure by us), residence over many years beyond the boundaries of the national element of her birth, or deeper, more personal reasons, it is impossible to judge. We simply do not want to lose of the best prose writers of the last decade of the present century (Stepanian 2001 trans. LCK).

Evgenii Ben'iash, writing in *Дружба народов* writes candidly of Tolstay's novel:

> This publication has for the best part met with bitter-sweet reviews: (obviously we have to set to one side the ecstatic and quite unfounded reviews which preceded publication. Rather, this is normal practice in the commercial procedure of the publishing house, especially unavoidable with today's realizable sales figures – and Tolstay's novel has a print run of 10,000 copies). We have to note that that the benchmark for serious literature is rising empirically.
>
> On the back cover of Tolstaya's book can be found, as is customary, advertising quotes from two leading literary figures – Boris Akunin and Aleksandr Genis, as well as one Dunya Smirnova. At this point one is involuntarily reminded of the long-gone-out-of-fashion drinking-song among blacksmiths who gave a sarafan to a certain Dunya (whether she was a friend

common to them all, or a relative the song doesn't say). "Wear it, Dunya, don't get it dirty, put it on for every festivity!" But while Dunya's sarafan lay in a chest, awaiting those festivities a 'bloody great cockroach' chewed holes in it.

Something similar has happened to the relatively slim in size novel of Tatyana Tolstaya which was all of fourteen years in the writing. The fact that this literary sarafan, all the while gathering dust in the computer turned out to be roundly tainted by its reviewers and publicists is yet another misfortune. But something even worse has happened. Never has an as yet unworn new item of clothing gone hopelessly out of fashion. Even more than that, never has it turned out to be totally dysfunctional judged by present-day social conditions.

To suspect Tatyana Tolstoya (with all her aristrocratic aesthetics!) of inclining towards folk-tale narration or back-to-the-soil sentiments would be too absurd. There then remains the parody. But here the writer has hopelessly and completely come along too late. The way I see it, parody of *skaz* has been completely exhausted by the immortal miniature of Il'f and Petrov […].

'Secondary' – practically every page of Tolstaya's novel is stamped with this invisible mark. To say that it is derivative means that it is boring not only in the stylistic sense, but in terms of genre too.

Кысь is an anti-utopian novel. A cautionary novel. Its plot belongs to the same general type as such a novel. An Explosion has taken place in Russia. (The book was begun in1986, therefore an association with the Chernobyl' catastrophe naturally arises) […].

While Tolstaya has been composing her novel, the themes broached in it have many, many times been raised and discussed, chewed over and chewed over again and again not only in journalism, but also in scientific-historical, political and even philosophical literature. This partly relates to the stubborn cyclic nature in which would-be Russian history slips past. This very scholastic thesis became one of the main motifs of the novel.

Esentially, there are two motifs. Besides the one just mentioned there is another one which ought to be called the main one. And it can be formulated in such a banal sentence as this: 'he looks into a book and sees sfa'.

Once Tolstaya wrote lovely stories. It is true that she wrote seldom. In her own words she began writing at all in order to

> show how it really ought to be done. You will say, she's shown nothing. And just what did she write this 'Kys'' novel for? Surely she hasn't decided to become a professional writer? Whatever demand there was for it, once it has gone away it didn't work for another. It does happen – it's called the creative process (Ben'iash 2001 trans. LCK).

Writing in *Литературная газета*, Alla Latynina makes the point that the beginning of Tolstaya's project in writing the novel co-incided with the popular fascination for the 'anti-utopian' embraced at that time by the intellectual stratum of society. This, rather than Chernobyl, may have inspired the author, since the start of *perestroika* was in fact a time of the publication of books banned for years, a time when they were read by the masses and a time of much discussion of them in the press. At that time the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Politburo were still in existence and the KGB seemed all-powerful. The tenets of communism were taught in higher education institutions and the liberalism of the "architects of perestroika" went no further than acknowledgement that in the pursuit of building an utterly equitable society, several errors had been allowed to take place. Latynina, in common with others, laments that Tolstaya's book did not come out at that time when it would indeed have been read as an incisive satire on Soviet reality. Latynina picks up on the interesting fact that the novel really turns the position of the classic utopian novel on its head, in that Benedikt actually betrays his benevolent teacher in the end, lending the narration an extra ironic touch:

> But is it possible to create a working "model of Russian history" with the help of an intensive attack on the "usual positions" and caustic sarcasm? I am afraid it is not. I want to hope that Russian history nevertheless has substance, that it is not spinning along an exclusive circle […] in my view Tolstaya has not created any universal model of Russian history and – thank God – there are no definitive answers to the "eternal questions" in the novel […] and just what is there? There is a masterfully concocted cocktail of anti-utopian writing, satire, of the paradoxically re-worked trademarks of science fiction, of a richly-flavoured elegant linguistic game and a generously seasoned proprietary Tolstoyan misanthropy. The novel is not deep, but it is brilliant. Nothing more, but nothing less (Latynina 2000 trans. LCK).

This concludes the part of this dissertation investigating Russian aspects of *Кысь*. The next chapter includes a summary of the reception of the novel in translation in the USA, and the remaining three chapters contain in-depth analysis of the translation of several passages, looking at both linguistic and cultural aspects.

Chapter 2: Theories and Criticism of Translation

I now move on to the study of *Кысь* in translation. My thesis is that, of the many different styles and techniques available to the translator, the multi-layered structure of the Russian text (the source text) requires a very particular approach if the translated text (the target text) is to come close to capturing the essence of the original. However pressures put on the translator may be such that, if this is precluded, the result is a target text that does justice neither to the source text nor to the skill of the translator. In pursuing this argument, I shall be focussing on the English-language translation by the American Jamey Gambrell, published in the USA in 2003 under the title *The Slynx* (Tolstaya 2003a). Before providing a detailed analysis of some of the structures of this particular translation, this chapter provides an overview of the various theories relating to translation that have evolved over time, to enable reference points to be established as to what might be expected from such a translation at the start of the 21st century. I then turn to the importance of critical evaluation of the target text, in particular examining the questions that should be asked and answered in any critical review. The chapter concludes by putting some critical reviews under the spotlight; those in question are American reviews of *The Slynx* that appeared in major newspapers and magazines in early 2003. These provide an illuminating contrast with the Russian reviews already examined, pointing the way to the detailed studies of the remainder of this dissertation; also included for the insights they provide are a couple of English language reviews of the source text.

2.1 Translation in Practice: an Overview

2.1.1. Introduction

A review of the theory of translation is particularly relevant at the present time given the development of the descriptive style of translation analysis which has developed over the last ten years. This has come about at the same time as Translation Studies establishes itself as an independent discipline with a scientific status of its own: one consequence of the descriptive approach is that, in moving away from prescriptive theories by adopting an entirely neutral stance when examining the components of a translation, the importance of critical evaluation of

the end product may be overlooked. In the following, the many influences which may shape a translation are examined, including the parameters which have been set both by and for the translator. This section includes a view of translation theory as it impacts on Russian literature, illustrating how different translation techniques have been employed to ensure the credibility of the target text. In the following, unless otherwise indicated, all comments refer to literary translations.

2.1.2. Prescriptive Translation Theories

A common starting point amongst reviewers of translation theories is Dryden's preface to Ovid's *Epistles,* written in 1680, in which the concept of 'paraphrase or translation with latitude' was introduced (Dryden 1956) as the mean between the two extremes of 'metaphrase' (pedantic literalism, a rewording one word at a time) and 'imitation' ('free' translation, a rewording in the style of the practitioner). The metaphrase /paraphrase distinction is the precursor of the 'word for word'/'sense for sense' translation debate which has continued ever since. Whereas Dryden considered metaphrase to be undesirable, preferring paraphrase, his view on imitation was that it lay beyond the limits of translation. The question of where the limits of translation lie is still the subject of continuing debate, one that can be approached by defining what is not a translation and stipulating that whatever remains must fall within the limits of translation. The notion of limits of translation naturally carries over to the concept of translatability, for the narrower the limits, the greater the likelihood that an attempted translation of a text has to result in these limits being broached and hence the source text being defined as untranslatable.

One theoretical understanding of where the limits may lie was addressed in Schleiermacher's 1813 treatise *On the Different Methods of Translation*, the debate being widened into sociological directions through his definition of the limits of 'true' translation. Schleiermacher approached his subject by means of a series of dualisms, the last of which was a distinction between 'taking the author to the reader' and 'taking the reader to the author'.

> Either the translator leaves the author in peace and moves the reader towards him, or he leaves the reader in peace and adapts the author. The two methods are so completely different that the

> one chosen must be followed as consistently as possible, as a mixture can have most unsatisfactory results, whereby author and reader completely lose sight of each other. (Schleiermacher 1995: 10).

The practice of leaving the reader in peace by making a foreign text easily accessible to the target reader (the assimilative approach) was deemed by Schleiermacher to be beyond the limits of true translation, whereas the alternative method, taking the reader to the author by insisting that the former be subjected to the transformative influences of the foreign culture of the author's world (the practice of foreignisation), was defined to be the only true form of translation.

This view was closely mirrored by Walter Benjamin who, in his essay *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers* (The Task of the Translator[1]) (Benjamin 1923), underlined the importance of a translation as a text in its own right and something which was not confined to a secondary role. Although Benjamin was writing at a time in the nineteen twenties when modernist thought demanded that literary form should be experimented with in order to revitalize culture, he came to a similar conclusion as Schleiermacher, that translation should be *foreignised* as a way of offering the reader a new, more demanding insight into a foreign text. For Benjamin, a translation was a continuation of the original and as such its priorities were language and form rather than the transfer of meaning:

> A true translation is translucent - it does not obscure the original and does not stand in its light, but allows the pure language to fall, intensified as it were by its own medium, all the more fully on to the original. Above all this requires a literal approach in the transfer of syntax, and it is precisely this, the word and not the sentence, which proves to be the basic tool of the translator. For the sentence is the wall which guards the language of the

[1] Paul de Man has underlined the ambiguity of the word *Aufgabe*: as well as 'task', it can also mean a renunciation or rejection (de Man 1989). Commenting, Patrick Primavesi invokes the alternative meaning: 'According to Benjamin […] the translator enacts the ideal of translatability by a deformation or even destruction of the work of literature in so far as it has been the expression of an individual intention. From this point of view, the task of the translator is always connected to an expropriation […] one might even draw the conclusion that the translator has been or should be "given up"' (Primavesi 1999: 54)

> original and literalness the arcade bidding entry. (ibid: 18, trans. LCK[1])

Benjamin's view that a strict literal rendering of syntax came before comprehensibility has been the basis on which others have structured an extension to the limits of translation, opening up new horizons for possible translations, although conversely Benjamin had also advocated a narrowing of the limits through asserting that a meaning-centred translation was not only bad but did not rank as a translation at all.

To these views can be added those of Vladimir Nabokov, who sees the work of the translator consisting of an attempt 'to reproduce with absolute exactitude the whole text, and nothing but the text' (Nabokov 1955) with the aid of extensive footnotes:

> Three grades of evil can be discerned in the queer world of verbal transmigration. The first, and lesser one, comprises obvious errors due to ignorance or misguided knowledge. […] The next step to Hell is taken by the translator who intentionally skips words or passages that he does not bother to understand […] he is ready to know less than the author as he is to think he knows better. The third, and worst, degree of turpitude is reached when a masterpiece is planished and patted into such a shape, vilely beautified in such a fashion as to conform to the notions and prejudices of a given public. This is a crime, to be punished by the stocks as plagiarists were in the shoe buckle days. (Nabokov 1982: 315)

The notion of foreignisation has received further support through the work of Venuti (1995) who defined it as the active foregrounding of culturally-specific items in order to signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text (ibid: 18) and contrasted it to his antipathy towards the preparation of translations giving the illusion of texts being naturally written in the target language (domestication), the translator being an invisible manufacturer of a product moulded to suit a target-language culture and aimed at producing *fluency* (ibid: 5). As a further extension of

[1] Benjamin's is a difficult text and one is conscious that the currently used English version (by Harry Zohn) is a translation that is 'helpful […] although it misses in some parts the expressiveness and also the content of the essay.' (Primavesi 1999: 58)

this principle, Joseph Graham's collection of papers following a 1985 conference includes a contribution from Philip Lewis in which Benjamin's strict literalism of syntax is replaced by 'abusive translation' with the goal of defamiliarisation rather than incomprehensibility: 'if a work is worth translating then it should not just slip unobtrusively into the target language …' (Lewis 1985: 41)

An entirely opposing view has centred on the issue of a translation achieving an equivalent effect, where the target text produces the same effects on those receiving it as those produced by the source language text on its original readers (Nida 1965). Nida allowed for a dichotomy in different situations between two kinds of translation, those with 'formal' and 'dynamic' equivalence ('word for word' and 'sense for sense') whilst giving greatest import to communication of meaning. When Nida (1964) decided to translate the phrase 'Lamb of God' in his Bible translation as 'Seal of God' for the Eskimo culture, where lambs are unfamiliar and the seal is naturally associated with innocence, Nida's strategy seems in many ways to have been a balanced one, combining fidelity with pragmatics. If translation is thought of along a continuum from literal (Source Language Bias) to free (Target Language Bias), as suggested by Newmark (1981: 39), then Nida's approach would appear mid-way, a faithful and purely semantic approach, but with target-culture bias. In doing so, however, it is clear that Nida's translation nevertheless fails to convey the concept of 'sacrifice' as embodied within the description of Christ as the 'Lamb of God'[1]. Newmark classifies Nida's approach as *communicative* translation, one which conveys the 'force rather than the content' (ibid: 39), addressing itself entirely towards target language readers who do not expect any awkward or jarring expressions and would expect foreign elements to be transferred into their own culture and language. This approach would appear to be the complete opposite to that of foreignisation which judges the success of a translation on its ability to create socio-cultural tensions for target language readers. Instead, it rates a translation which gives the target culture more of what it is used to.

Another approach to defining the limits of translation is advocated by the manipulation school of translation practitioners, who group translation together with other forms of text manipulation (e.g. criticism, editing) to explore commonalities

[1] See John, Chpt 1, v 29, 'The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!'.

and to define those features which distinguish each from the others. In the view of the manipulation school, the socially controlled limits of translation are reached when 'the translator is perceived as speaking in a voice that is not the original author's, or using words that the author did not write and could not have written' (Robinson 2000: 18).

With the various prescriptive translation theories each making their own particular and persuasive cases, it is important not to lose sight of the practicalities of translation. In the modern discipline of Translation Studies, current debate also relates to the different possibilities open to the translator and the ways in which these are influenced by the social and cultural factors relevant at any particular time. These topics are considered next.

2.1.3. Translation Studies: the Linguistic and Cultural Approaches

The last thirty years have seen the launch of the modern discipline of 'Translation Studies', aiming to encapsulate the many strands of approaching translation under the one roof, but being broadly divisible into two orientations, the 'linguistic' and the 'cultural'. In its infancy, Translation Studies leaned heavily on the established tools and methods of linguistics, concentrating on formalising ways for translators to transfer source text into another language to produce an accurate target text, in other words applying itself to what can happen and to what should happen.

Such methods are still of key importance in the realm of Applied Translation Studies, such as the training of skilled interpreters and translators working in scientific and medical specialities. It is the case that the linguistic orientation can tend towards the prescriptive, and mainstream Translation Studies has also developed a cultural orientation, turning to a consideration of the wide range of options available to any potential translator undertaking a new commission. Some of those will be considered to be the expected procedures which, if adopted, will lead to an 'acceptable' translation: they are known as the normative expectations or norms and constitute what is being demanded of a translation, what will be tolerated and what is being encouraged.

For a translator, an essential competence is the ability to select and apply norms: a norm is neither true nor false but is a notion of what is proper in the context of producing a 'correct' translation, this in turn being a product of social and cultural values, and in particular on who or what regulates a translation through control based on power and position. Typical issues with which norms are concerned include the choice of the material to be translated, the importance given to adequately representing the source text and the level of acceptability required within the target culture. Being cultural entities, norms are not fixed in stone but are subject to change over time. Norms of translation depend directly on the genre of the text: this chapter has related to literary translation, but the idea of norms is equally valid for other skills such as technical translation (e.g. instruction manuals) and interpreting, in both of which there will be an understanding as to what constitutes an 'acceptable' translation. Norms underscore the ideas of *skopostheorie*, formulated by Hans Vermeer, which sees translation as a procedure initiated by a commissioner who orders a translation for a particular purpose (the *skopos* of the text), the translator then following a set of instructions to prepare an oral or written "target text" for 'transcultural interacting' on the basis of source-text material (Vermeer 2000). S*kopostheorie* dictates that translation is an independent form of writing, distinct from the source text, which creates and reflects different linguistic and cultural contexts, thus orienting the translation at the right extreme of the literal/free continuum envisaged by Newmark, (although not necessarily designating free translation as the goal).

In another commentary on the subject of 'acceptable' translation, Venuti highlights the fact that most translations, regardless of genre, are deemed acceptable by publishers, reviewers and other readers when they read fluently, that is without displaying any 'linguistic or stylistic peculiarities', and that such a translation gives 'the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text – the appearance […] that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the "original".' (Venuti 1995: 1). For Venuti, the folly of producing translations so fluent that the hand of the translator is invisible is manifold: firstly, the translator is doing himself a professional disservice - the ambiguity of the US translator's work-for-hire contract is cited as proof, whereby the translator must

warrant that his work "will be original" and at the same time accept that "the employer or person for whom the work was prepared is considered the author …" (Venuti 1995:10); secondly, the inevitable consequence of accepting lower status than authors is reduced earnings, resulting in the need to turn out higher levels of translations which 'inevitably limits the literary invention and critical reflection applied to a project' (ibid:11); thirdly, this situation is further complicated by the fact that although English is the most translated language worldwide, it is not much translated into, and this creates a trade imbalance which is naturally accompanied by a shift towards an Anglo-American political and economic hegemony, actively contributing to the expansion of Anglo-American culture, in turn resulting in a diminution of indigenous cultures.

2.1.4. Essentialism and Non-Essentialism

The two orientations of Translation Studies, the 'linguistic' and the 'cultural', are part of the background to the dichotomy of the 'essentialist' versus 'non-essentialist' approaches to translation. The basis of the essentialist view is the concept that 'truth' and 'meaning' are intrinsically stable and can be conceived as "an immobile, recoverable essence" which can "be forever kept and protected from difference and change" (Arrojo 1998:28). As such, meaning is transported among different languages, hence enabling universal translation laws to be formulated consisting of adequate equivalents and universally accepted ethical terms based on linguistics as the science of language, shedding a definitive light on all language phenomena (ibid).

The trouble with this is "undoubtedly the hopeless search for a theory which would not only tackle the 'problem' of translation once and for all but which would achieve such a solution as far away as possible from the unpredictability of its practice and practitioners" (ibid:29). There is a view that the traditional separation in linguistics between the semantic and pragmatic levels, the former referring to information and the latter to language used for effect, can be applied to translation theory, with the "information content of the original […] generally transferable" (Lefevere 1992:17). Rendering the power of the language used for effect, most relevant to literary works, is acknowledged as not always being satisfactorily undertaken.

The cultural, as distinct from the linguistic, orientation of Translation Studies leans towards the non-essentialist approach to translation, which considers meaning to be socially based, historically produced and not intrinsic to texts or any other form of discourse; the non-essentialist distrust of any possibility of any intrinsically stable meaning shares common ground with postmodern theories of literature. A non-essentialist view is that "strictly essentialist goals and assumptions are not only paralysing, but also mercilessly excluding" (Arrojo 1998:39) and that under such a regime "the translator's task is accordingly that of an invisible carrier whose job is primarily mechanical: to make sure that the transferral of meaning is safely conducted without interfering with the content of whatever is being transported" (ibid). This compares with the stretched definitions of the limits of translation in the non-essentialist approach: any attempt to produce a rigorous translation model would have to include all "conceptions" which "represent translations" on account of their having "been recognized as such at least by some groups" (ibid: 38). Criticised for amateurism and a lack of methodology and absolute values, the non-essentialist response is: "If meaning is recognized as being social and conventional and, thus, provisionally produced by ideology and history, what could possibly be absolute?" (ibid: 35). The issues raised by translation between different languages are seen to be common with those occurring in disciplines involved with language generally, including non-essentialist philosophy and cultural studies. For example, the point of view of deconstructive thought expressed in the work of Derrida is that "we will never have, and in fact have never had, to do with some 'transport' of pure signifieds from one language to another, or within one and the same language, that the signifying instrument would leave virgin and untouched" (Derrida 1987:20). On this basis, meaning cannot be repeated even within the same language, hence "the traditional notion of the 'original' and the relationships that it has been allowed to establish with translation and translators are also radically revised" (Arrojo 1998:41) and translation can be recognized as "a regulated transformation of one language to another, of one text to another" (Derrida 1987:20).

Under this approach, the objective of translation to be the "transfer of a meaning or a truth from one language to another without any essential harm being done" is not considered possible (Derrida 1985:119-20); those agreeing with the ideas of

deconstruction could expound that "the translator's visibility in the target text is no longer an embarrassment to be avoided, or a problem for theory to solve once and for all, and becomes the focal point of translation scholarship in postmodern times" (Arrojo 1998:42)

Others maintain that such a view of the translator's visibility should be heavily qualified: Anthony Pym argues that linguistic variations such as accents, dialects, and sociolects need to be translated in order to create 'authenticity' in translation as opposed to what he sees as 'parody'. Parody for Pym is 'a wilful reduction of variations to just a few, which are then emphasised through repetition and **played with** by being produced inconsistently' (Pym 2000:2) (my emphasis). Pym cites the examples of 'false Andalusian' employed by Spanish comedians, and Monty Pythonesque Yorkshire working-class English :'We had to get oop at free in monin', go down mill, come 'ome an …' (ibid) , where the dropping of 'h', and 'oo' for 'u' serve as markers for working-class Yorkshire speech. (In passing it has to be said that Pym cites 'irregular omission of the definite article' as a similar marker, but generally the more usual rendering is 'down t'mill' where the definite article 'the' is truncated to 't''.)

For Pym, 'authenticity' occurs with a 'multiplication of variations […] such that a variety is represented in so much detail, with such a wide range of finely nuanced, accented features, local lexis and faintly non-standard syntax, that the linguistic result must surely be the real thing,' (ibid)

Where Pym clashes directly with Arrojo and other proponents of deconstruction in translation is when he says that 'even fewer solutions will ensue if we consider translations to be entirely different from non-translations, as if there were nothing to be learned from the realm of straight discourse analysis or monolingual television-watching.' (ibid: 4). In what might be seen as a barb aimed at those scholars who favour less invisibility and indeed more active intervention in translation, Pym insists that foreignization is no more than an 'imperialist ploy for distanced intellectuals', that source texts can already be foreignized 'before the translator enters the scene' and that the challenge is to 'carry on or **thwart**' that which has already begun' (ibid.) (my emphasis). This view would seem to strongly oppose that put by such as the

feminist school of thought (which favours surecriture/supplementarite and 'hi-jacking' of text, e.g. Luise von Flotow, Mary Daly, Barbara Godard, Francoise Massardier-Kennedy), Venuti (who rails against the translator's 'invisibility' and actively promotes a 'foreignized' translation) and Arrojo, for whom difference is the basic trait of translation.

Kaisa Koskinen takes the debate on translator autonomy further in discussing the works mainly of Anthony Pym, Rosemary Arrojo and the influence of Vermeer's *skopostheorie.* Koskinen argues that Translation Studies is moving away from the traditional dichotomy between fidelity and free translation towards an ethic that embraces more the plurality of decision-making and the play of differences within the translating process. In so doing, she cites Jacques Derrida's theory of deconstruction as underpinning this shift, quoting from Derrida's *Des Tours de Babel* (1985), a work which draws on both the myth of Babel and Walter Benjamin's *Das Aufgabe des Übersetzers*[1](sic).

Drawing on the curse of Babel and the commitment implied in the word *Aufgabe*, Derrida develops the idea of translation as a duty, a debt and a responsibility (ibid: 174-175), but stresses that the text to be translated is equally indebted: 'The original is the first debtor, the first petitioner; it begins by lacking and by pleading for translation' (ibid:184). However, no translation can ever exhaust the translative possibilities, and Derrida stresses the unfinishedness of translation. Meaning can be deferred and different and so Derrida uses the neologism *différance* to embrace this concept. Within this word, we can see the two meanings of the French verb différer (to 'defer' and 'to differ' in English) and an adaptation of the ordinary word *différence*, spelt with an 'a' in the suffix in order to evoke the gerund from the present participle – *différent* - of the verb *différer* – hence a kind of 'deferring involving difference'.

For Derrida, *différance* itself is not a word with a stable meaning, but rather a condition of a possibility for meanings, the effects of its movement being of 'play'. Kathleen Davis highlights that 'play' or the French '*jeu*' is not just to be understood in its ludic sense but also, as Derrida has explained, in 'the sense of that which, by the

[1] Benjamin's text 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers' has been mistakenly rendered by using the neuter instead of the feminine definite article before 'Aufgabe' (Koskinen 2001: 35).

spacing between the pieces of an apparatus, allows for movement and articulation' (1987a/1992:64) Since meaning cannot come before *différance*, there can be no pure totally unified origin of meaning. For Koskinen, translation is governed by 'the law imposed by the name of God who in one stroke commands and forbids you to translate by showing and hiding from you the limit' (Koskinen 2000: 204).

Translation, furthermore, is also governed by Derrida's concept of the *supplement* which can be defined as an extra addition. 'It adds itself, it is a surplus, a plenitude enriching another plenitude' (Derrida 1976: 111) which at the same time indicates something lacking and acts as compensation 'if it adds, it adds to replace, if it fills, it is as one fills a void, if it represents, it is by the anterior default of a presence' (ibid: 145)

Koskinen too cautions that 'deconstruction is not tantamount to giving translators licence to do whatever they please' and that, in its supplementary function, translation 'will truly be a moment in the growth of the original' (Derrida 1985a, 188).

One must here ask whether Koskinen is positing deconstruction as a concept which might replace the traditionalist (essentialist) concepts of fidelity and equivalence in translation in response to more recent developments in translation practice, such as Hans Vermeer's *skopostheorie*, critical postcolonialism and feminism? One might be forgiven for asking if we have always been strictly bound by the tenets of fidelity and equivalence?

Kirsten Malmkjær, in particular, makes the point that basing any debate on how far essentialist and non-essentialist approaches to translation can be reconciled is today 'anarchistic and futile' (Malmkjær 2000:346) in as much as relativity, multiplicity and dependency of 'meaning' seem to have long become common currency in such areas of the humanities as pragmatics, sociolinguistics and with the impact of cultural studies over the last decade. This writer would agree with that view.

2.1.5. Translation Theory and Russian Literature

Russian literature in the form of English-language translations of the 19th century fiction of the great prose writers became immensely popular after the 1880s, primarily through the work of Constance Garnett (1861-1946) who began to study Russian in 1892. Despite only visiting Russia twice, her translations of some 80 volumes became the accepted standards and played a major role in introducing the English-speaking world to Russian fiction. Although she began her translations with the works of Turgenev, the popularity of Russian writing took off in 1912 with her translation of Dostoevsky's *Братья Карамазовы* (The Brothers Karamazov); this particularly appealed to the Bloomsbury group, one of whose members John Middleton Murry compared the translation to the 'most epoch-making translations of the past' (Moser 1988: 435). Other writers translated by Garnett include Tolstoy, Chekhov and Gogol'. Garnett's texts are for the most part accurate although her style, to modern tastes slightly formal but easy to read, appears to tone down or mute jarring features of the source texts. As Rachel May comments however, she 'had this gift of convincing her readers that she "must be right" […] they accepted her word *as* Turgenev, *as* Chekhov, *as* Russian prose' (May, 1994a: 143). May goes on to extol the comparative virtues of the recent Dostoevsky translations by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonskii, saying that these translations "demonstrate his [Dostoevsky's] penchant for prevarication and noncommittal narration", adding that students should be given 'a page of Garnett's trustworthy, conscientious "truth" for comparison' (ibid.) But for Peter France, Pevear and Volokhonsky's 'desire to replicate the vocabulary or the syntax of the Russian results sometimes in unnecessary awkwardness and obscurity' (France 2000b: 597).

From the point of view of translation theory, it is instructive to look at contrasting translations of two works of Russian literature. The first of these is Pushkin's novel in verse *Евгений Онегин* (Evgenii Onegin or Eugene Onegin), originally translated in 1881 by Lt. Col. H. Spalding (Pushkin 1881). According to Briggs, this translation is 'tasteful and largely accurate in detail […] its easy assimilation is due to a bold decision taken by the translator, to use only masculine rhymes (rhymes of one syllable)' (Briggs 2000: 585). In order to preserve the rhythmic flow of Pushkin's stanza, subsequent translators have utilised feminine rhymes (i.e. of two syllables):

Briggs comments that 'such rhymes are hard to find in English, so that hackneyed rhymes and the jingling use of participles become indispensable' (ibid.). There is one exception to this general style of translation, that of Vladimir Nabokov who, in 1944, produced a translation with a commentary (Pushkin 1944). Having poured scorn on earlier translations, Nabokov's own rendition was a literal version, meticulously accurate but with only the vaguest sense of any rhythm: its dependability makes it a definitive version invaluable as a reference point. This example is a classic case of the relative merits of 'word for word' and 'sense for sense' translations being in sharp contrast. The source text continues to inspire new translations, some to critical acclaim, although in the opinion of Briggs 'no translation has come near to capturing the acoustic opulence and skill of this novel; the two languages, despite some similarities, are simply too far apart' (Briggs 2000: 585).

Of quite another style is the novel *Петербург* (Petersburg) written by the Russian modernist Andrei Belyi, first appearing in 1913 and then again in 1922 following extensive revision. The book has many striking similarities to James Joyce's *Ulysses* which it predates, although it did not appear in an English translation until 1959 (by John Cournos) (Belyi 1959). This translation was dismissed as bearing 'only incidental resemblance to the original' by Robert Maguire and John Malmstrad (Belyi 1978) in their 1978 translation of the 1922 revised source text, 'a meticulous piece of work with very few errors […] accompanied by extensive notes (very necessary, in view of the novel's complex literary and historical references)' (Falchikov 2000: 606). This very deliberate attempt to take the reader to the author was repeated in a subsequent translation by David McDuff (Belyi 1995) of the original 1913 source text, a longer version containing some difficult passages removed in the revision. Falchikov notes that Maguire and Malmstad 'deal more adroitly with Belyi's (sometimes rather tiresome) verbal wit… whereas McDuff tends to leave the Russian […] or invents hybrids like "coursiste" or "gimnasiast"' (Falchikov 2000: 606-7). McDuff's notes are less extensive but he offers an introduction on the genesis of the novel. In both renditions the translators work with the high visibility they deem necessary to do justice to a work of this nature.

Before leaving Russian literature, it is valuable to examine one genre that has been much translated, namely folk tales, the primary source being the collections of

Afanas'ev, eight volumes of which appeared from 1855-63. The pioneering translation was that by W.R.S. Ralston in 1873 under the title *Russian Folk Tales*, combining scholarly comments with 51 stories translated, in Ralston's words, as 'literally as possible' (Ralston 1873). Ralston's translations were read by Arthur Ransome who 'while disliking what seemed to me the unsuitable "literary" prose, saw what rich material was there […] I had made up my mind to learn enough Russian to be able to read Russian folklore in the original and to tell these stories in the simple language that they seemed to need' (Ransome 1976: 157). Ransome went on to write 25 tales for inclusion in *Old Peter's Russian Tales*, specially written for children (Ransome 1916): he remarked in the preface to the 1938 reissue that he was only the editor, to which France adds 'like all transmitters and translators, he was a remaker, a rewriter' (France 1995: 37). Ransome has noted that he began with 'more or less word-for-word translations' before realising that 'direct translation is not the way to tell Russian stories to English children' who would not have the knowledge of Russian life to appreciate the tales and for whom footnotes would destroy the life of the story; in the end he read 'as many variants of a folk story as I could find and then laid them all aside while writing the story for myself' (Ransome 1976: 162). Comparing Ransome's target text, where possible, with the source text of Afanas'ev, France notes that Ransome's story-telling voice makes it clear that the tales are meant for children; he does this by 'creating a narrator, Old Peter, and child listeners […] who converse in and around the tales', enabling him to answer 'one of the crucial problems in writing for children, that of finding a narrative voice'; having done this, he 'prefers to fill out the scene in advance, giving the story far greater body' (France 195: 43). In fact there are two narrators, the frame narrator and the main narrator, Uncle Peter, who is allowed by Ransome 'many of the stylistic traits of the story-teller, repetitions, exaggeration, various rhythmical effects…' (ibid.: 43-44). France concludes that 'Ransome's framing device, though essential to his purposes, does not radically affect his retelling of the stories […] he kept alive the notion that the modern story-teller too […] can still attract an audience that is not defined by age' (ibid.: 45)

Thus there are well-established precedents for translators coping with the 'strangeness' of the subject matter of Russian source texts by guiding the reader

through either an academic approach of extensive footnotes or by expanding on the source text to set the scene as a Russian reader would understand it.

2.1.6. Descriptive Translation Studies

Translation Studies, in moving beyond concentrating on the questions of what can and what should happen into the area of what does happen, has developed a new branch of research, namely the so-called 'descriptive translation studies'. In this discipline, the empirical student of Translation Studies confines research to the description and analysis of what is, the aim being to introduce a non-normative approach to the field of translation, one that ascribes translation criticism to Applied Translation Studies (Toury 1995). The approach is akin to a scientific study: Toury's emphasis is on the effect of the translated text within the target culture, how it relates to other kinds of writing which have adapted to the pressures within that culture and how those pressures have resulted in any manipulation of the source text, in each case the analysis being non-judgemental. The role of norms is central to such a study, and it is essential for this approach that the study of how they are created and maintained is undertaken in as neutral a manner as possible, maintaining the strict separation of 'science' from 'criticism', although Toury has suggested that the findings of descriptive science can be used to produce better-informed critical standards (ibid: 17-19).

The type of question to which this approach can be applied is not whether the source texts have been delivered more or less intact, but relates to the nature and selectivity of the changes which have occurred during the translation process, and to why certain of these changes have been made rather than others. Indeed, one reason for the interest in Translation Studies is that it 'provides first-hand evidence of how cultures manufacture seemingly transparent but in fact heavily selective and loaded representations of other cultures' (Hermans 2000:10). Interestingly, the neutrality of the scientific approach has enabled an assessment to be made of what was traditionally taken for granted, namely the translator's obligation to be totally neutral. As is to be expected, translators and particularly interpreters are subject to the pressures of being real-time practitioners in a communicative act and descriptive

studies ‘have shown quite clearly that interpreters are not completely neutral, even when they believe they should be’ (Baker 2000b: 23).

The emerging discipline of Translation Studies has been greatly assisted by the development of corpora, texts held in electronic format which can be searched using appropriate software. The use of corpora in studying translation is covered in detail in Chapter 3 as a preliminary to explaining how some of the techniques have been used during preparation of this dissertation; the following is a resumé of how the availability of corpora have extended the options available to the empirical student of Translation Studies.

The study of corpora in this field was a natural extension to the established research field of corpus linguistics; its effect was immediately felt in the linguistic arm of Translation Studies where the analysis of corpora initially focussed on repeated events, enabling in turn an evaluation of the non-typical and the creative.

An extension to the use of corpora was to utilise its capabilities to identify whether features exist which distinguish the language of translations from that of ordinary language users, in particular to test the theories of Baker (1996) who argued that translation is subject to a set of constraints which inevitably leave traces in the language that translators produce. To this end the Translational English Corpus (TEC) consisting of a large body of translated texts (with works of fiction being well represented) has been established which can be compared to the British National Corpus (which contains no translated texts), the two corpora forming what is called a ‘comparable’ corpus. Perhaps surprisingly, the TEC contains no source texts, its purpose being not to search for patterns of translation by comparing source against target texts (which would require a ‘parallel’ corpus), but rather to test for features of translated text in general, such as evidence of ‘… essentially a third code which arises out of the bilateral consideration of the matrix and target codes: it is, in a sense, a sub-code of each of the codes involved’ (Frawley 1984: 168). Were there to be a ‘third code’, that is a special form of language that evolves through the translation process as a kind of compromise between the patterns of the source and target languages, it would appear to be confirmation of the existence of the much derided ‘translationese’, the type of artificial language that confirms to the readers of the

target language that they are indeed reading a translation. This is vigorously denied by Baker:

> There is no question here of talking about 'translationese', with all the pejorative connotations of this term. Translation results in the creation of a third code because it is a unique form of communication, not because it is a faulty, deviant or sub-standard form of communication (Baker 2000: 25).

Translation may be a unique form of communication, but there are good and not so good translations and the latter class could well exhibit evidence of 'translationese' were it to be definable. If confirmation of the existence of a third code can be demonstrated, then it can be presumed to feature in all translations, whereas 'translationese' will only feature in inferior products. With a view to explaining how to assess whether the target text succeeds in maximising its effectiveness as a 'good' translation, the next section of this chapter reviews the topic of translation criticism.

2.2. Translation Criticism

The scientific approach of descriptive translation studies seeks neutrality and seemingly seeks to put distance between itself and the area of translation criticism. The neutral stance creates critics of its own:

> …often the theoretical or scholarly apparatus leads to, or derives from, a particular and partisan view of what makes a good translation. Nor is this to be regretted. It is no doubt desirable to avoid confusing criticism and scholarship, but the need for evaluative criticism is a fundamental one in any society (France 2000a: 4).

> We may be aware that norms are not absolute, but in cultural life they are both inevitable and desirable, and it is precisely evaluative criticism which in large part maintains and modifies them (ibid: 7).

> Without proper criticism translators will always work- as they have long worked- with the impunity and irresponsibility that are born of 'invisibility'. Without criticism, they can get away with murder; with criticism, even hostile criticism, their work is given the recognition they deserve (Berman 1995: quoted in France 2000a: 7).

Outside of the fields of specialised translation, criticism can be allocated to one of two broad classes: that of the language teacher and that of the journalist/critic, who in turn are respectively commenting on the translation's adequacy and acceptability (Toury 1995: 56-7). Adequacy relates to demonstrating that the source text has been correctly understood by a translator who has produced accurate equivalent expressions in the target text. There is arguably an understanding by readers of a target text that significant elements of the source text have been translated with reasonable accuracy. Adequacy standards have not always been met: although contemporary reviewers of the mid 20th century praised the translations by Helen Lowe-Porter of the fictional works of Thomas Mann, some recent research has concluded that 'she clearly did not always understand the meaning of the German she was translating, and moreover, felt entitled to take unnecessary liberties that are tantamount to a distortion of what the author wrote' (Buck, 1996) ; in particular, her translation of *Death in Venice* left readers of the target text largely ignorant as to the sexual connotations of the source, culminating in the omission of an entire sentence at the end of the penultimate paragraph. Although 'most readers of translation would probably agree with the type of criticism launched by Timothy Buck against the inaccuracies in the Lowe-Porter translations' (France 2000a: 8), a defence of Lowe-Porter was offered by Venuti who pointed out, in a letter to the TLS on 24 November 1995, that when Buck 'complains that Lowe-Porter's *Death in Venice* gives a "false perception" of the interaction between Aschenbach and Tadzio, his examples indicate not so much deliberate distortion as a recasting of the erotic dynamic between the characters, perhaps for an American audience in the 1930s'. This example shows a leading supporter of the idea of foreignisation defending a translator for conforming to domestic norms of translation.

A similar example, however, of a translator's conforming to domestic norms of translation can be found in Nathan Dole's early English translation of Anna Karenin, when Anna's statement 'I am pregnant' is rendered as 'I am *beremenna*'. This instance is alluded to by Nabokov (without naming the translator) as 'making the foreign reader wonder what strange and awful Oriental disease that was; all because the translator thought that "I am pregnant" might shock some pure soul, and that a good idea would be to leave the Russian just as it stood.' (Nabokov 1982: 316) In his

round condemnation of such a translator, who 'fears it might stump a dunce or debauch a dauphin! Instead of blissfully nestling in the arms of the great writer, he keeps worrying about the little reader playing in a corner with something dangerous or unclean' (ibid), Nabokov omits to mention that Dole does attempt to deal with the matter of Victorian modesty by the use of paratext, namely a glossary at the end of the novel, when the offending sentence is coyly classified alphabetically under 'Y' for 'Ya' (the English 'I'). 'Ya Beremenna' (sic) is rendered as 'I am expecting my confinement' – a perfectly clear and acceptable euphemism of the time and mores. It might therefore be argued that Dole was merely 'recasting the dynamic' of the situation for a Victorian audience of the late 19th century. On another relevant question, that of editorial interference, we have no evidence unfortunately.

Beyond basic accuracy, adequacy can also call into question any suggestion that a translator practises normalisation - the practice of translating difficult lexical or syntactical structures into simplified forms in the target text, even to the extent of utilising a self-indulgent tendency to produce everything in their own style. (The search for normalisation is particularly amenable to the techniques of translation corpora theory and forms part of a more detailed discussion in Chapter 3.) On the other hand, a 'word for word' translation, which may be essential for technical translations and desirable for sacred texts, will frequently display strange features when it appears as target text. It is possible to express adequacy in ethical terms as a respect for the source text, but it is then an open question as to whether this is best achieved by a 'word for word' or 'sense for sense' translation.

The way a translation is received by a journalist/critic will depend on how that individual perceives the norms of the target culture with respect to a text produced in the language of and under the conditions of the particular foreign culture. Pronounced estrangement in the target text may be accepted as a deliberate choice by the translator, whilst a moderate form of strangeness may be put down to 'translationese' as a result of translator incompetence[1]. Venuti (1995: 2-4) provided

[1]An analogy is the 'Clinton shirt' effect. On a foreign visit, President Clinton and Prime Minister Blair were each offered a choice of three shirts to wear at a function, the garments being in the local style and garish to their tastes. Blair chose the least flamboyant, Clinton the most spectacular. Asked by Blair to explain his choice, Clinton responded that back home he would be seen as respecting the culture of his hosts, whereas Blair would be asked "Why are you wearing that shirt?" (Blair, A. Anecdote on TV programme *Parkinson*: ITV 4/3/2006).

excerpts from several reviews where translators were assessed against the norm of target language fluency, although acknowledgement was given in certain cases to the prestige of the source culture:

> An attempt has been made to use modern English which is lively without being slangy. Above all, an effort has been made to avoid the unthinking 'translationese' which has so often in the past imparted to translated Russian literature a distinctive, somehow 'doughy', style of its own with little relation to anything present in the original Russian (Hingley, in Venuti 1995: 4).

There does appear to be a difference between the norms of the target cultures of Britain vis-à-vis America when considering translated texts:

> Few outcries ensue when American translations, with the necessary orthographic and lexical changes, are co-published or reprinted in British collections; but when an occasional translation slips the other way and enters a mainstream American market, some vocabulary must be rewritten and a reviewer might remark an "occasionally disconcerting British accent" (as in Dickson, in Venuti 1995:3) (Pym 2000: 76).

Toury (1995: 278) suggested that a target culture tolerates foreign traces in a translation in accordance with the prestige of the source culture, and that when a target culture perceives its literature to be prestigious it is less keen to accept what it sees as 'contamination' of its language, disdainfully perceiving such breaches of target language fluency as 'translationese'. What is apparent is that, firstly, the norms of the target culture cannot be expressed simply in terms of a strategy of fluency against foreignisation and, secondly, norms are there to be broken (according the translator a moment of visibility). The translation that disturbs the target culture by breaking norms:

> …may be praised today less because it 'takes the reader to the author' (as Schleiermacher put it) than because in breaking the illusion of naturalness and advertising the fact that it is indeed a translation, it contributes to a modernist (or as we say now,

> postmodernist) subversion of the dominant culture.' (France 2000a: 9).

There are also other influences that extend the adequacy/acceptability criteria, for example, political (translation standards promoted by those who would colonize or, conversely, resistance groups), generic (translations ranging from children's books to poetry), geographic (translations designed for different parts of the world nominally speaking the same language) and gender (the hi-jacking of translation to produce feminist texts).

Critics of translations will continue to pass judgement based on their own evaluations of the merits of the texts against their norms. The modern theories of Translation Studies have at least led critical discussion to beyond simply whether a translation is good or bad: nowadays the questions to be asked are more pointed: 'What is the purpose of the translation? Who is it aimed at? How well does it achieve its purpose? It is within such a framework that translation critics should continue to assess translations in terms of both adequacy and acceptability (ibid: 10).

The final section of this chapter looks at reviews that appeared in American newspapers and magazines following publication of *The Slynx* (Tolstaya 2003a)

2.3. American Newspaper/Magazine Reviews of 'The Slynx'

2.3.1 Introduction

The English-language translation, *The Slynx* (Tolstaya 2003a), was published in February 2003 in the USA. The book was reviewed in several major newspapers and magazines[1], in many cases combined with a review of *Pushkin's Children: Writings on Russia and Russians* (Tolstaya 2003b), the collection of Tolstaya's essays that appeared at the same time. In both cases the translation was by Jamey Gambrell. In examining how the American critics reacted to *The Slynx*, four aspects are of particular interest: firstly, as a result of their having read the author's previous works published in translation, what pre-conceptions did the reviewers bring with them; secondly, how did the reviewers respond to the wider themes discussed in *Pushkin's Children* given that these are also relevant as background to *The Slynx*; thirdly, what was the response to the plot and narrative of *The Slynx* and the assessment of its literary merit and, finally, what opinions did the reviewers voice as to the merits of the translation, and how did they arrive at these. This section concludes with a summary of two English-language reviews of the Russian source text that were in the public domain prior to the publication of the translation, as these could have had an influence on the reviewers: indeed one of the reviews was quoted on the book's dust-cover. It is of interest to compare how these reviews contrast both with the reviews of the translation and with the Russian-language reviews published in Russia already described.

[1] The reviewers quoted in this section (along with the publications in which the reviews appeared) are:
Abramovich, Alex in *Washington Post* (2/2/03) (Abramovich 2003)
Banville, John in *New Republic* (6/3/03) (Banville 2003)
Bayley, John in *New York Review of Books* (27/2/03) (Bayley 2003)
Blair, Elaine in *Newsday* (12/1/03) (Blair 2003)
Eder, Richard in *New York Times Book Review* (26/1/03) (Eder 2003),
Herman, Carol in *Washington Times* (12/1/03) (Herman 2003)
Kakutani, Michiko in *New York Times* (11/2/03) (Kakutani 2003)
Uhler, Walter C. in *San Francisco Chronicle* (12/1/03) (Uhler 2003)

2.3.2. Previous Reputation

Tolstaya's reputation in America had been established by two collections of short stories written in Russia before she left for America in 1989. These appeared as *On the Golden Porch* (1989), translated by Antonina W. Bouis[1] (Tolstaya 1989), and *Sleepwalker in a Fog* (1992), translated by Jamey Gambrell (Tolstaya 1992). Reaction was favourable and the reviewers writing in 2003 were still complimentary over ten years later:

> Luminous, haunting stories most insistently recalled the work of Chekhov, mapping characters' inner lives and unfulfilled dreams with uncommon sympathy and insight […] effortlessly infused her portraits of the fools and dreamers in her short stories with sympathy and humour […] showcased the author's Nabokovian love of language and her affinity for strange excursions into the surreal, reminiscent of Bulgakov and Gogol (Kakutani)

The associations of Tolstaya's name also carried weight:

> Hers is an impeccable literary lineage […] and her work – she came to writing relatively late and is best known as an author of short stories – has done little to discredit the family name (Abramovich)

Her expertise in her chosen field was acknowledged:

> Given her stature as a writer of short stories… (Uhler)

It was also noted that the appeal of the earlier work had not been based on any political comment:

> Story collections linger over the shabby details of Soviet domestic life…the characters – aging men and women who feel the weight of years and have vivid waking dreams about better lives – are no less worn than their furniture, but Tolstaya fastidiously avoids mentioning the political system that had shaped their circumstances (Blair)

[1] Helena Goscilo, in her commentary on Tolstaya's fiction, was uncomplimentary: 'I rely on available translations, but amend them or provide my own when the translation is inaccurate (as happens in Antonina Bouis's renditions)' (Goscilo 1996: 10).

2.3.3. The Essays: *Pushkin's Children*

During her residency in America, which lasted almost ten years, Tolstaya supplemented her university teaching duties with journalism, producing articles for the *New Yorker* and the *New York Review of Books* amongst others. A collection of twenty essays written between 1990 and 2000, many of them reviews, made up *Pushkin's Children*: the articles were originally written in Russian and translated before their original publication. A major difference between the short stories and the essays relates to the target audience, the former having been written for a domestic Russian audience and their success in America being to the credit of her translators. On the other hand, Tolstaya's journalism was intended for an American audience and, freed of responsibilities to her homeland and her domestic readership, she was able to concentrate on interpreting the dramatic changes taking place in Russia as an expatriate writing for the benefit of her new fellow countrymen. There were certain themes amongst the essays that appealed to the reviewers, an example being the powers of observation she had already demonstrated in the short stories:

> The pieces are, almost without exception, exceptional […] A tenacious drive to explain what, exactly, this "Russia itself" could be. Luckily, Tolstaya is a bold and gifted generalist […] and the essays brim with observations no foreigner would bring herself to make (Abramovich)
>
> When she deals with the roiling life of Russia – its politics, history, culture, obsessions and its human defaults and its human superabundance – Tolstaya flares and circumscribes her subject like a back-burn set to contain a blaze. She fixes reality by using extremities of feeling and a poetic exactness of image (Eder)
>
> Her instinctive gifts – her compassion for self-deluding dreamers and misfits; her radar for the minute details of everyday life; her bright, quicksilver prose… (Kakutani)
>
> There are the great calamities, particularly Stalinism and all that it wrought, against which she rails in her essays; but, as with all good writers, it is in the details that she is her most telling (Banville)

Other features that appealed to the reviewers were the displays of wit:

> A collection of pieces […] of jousting witness to the radical transformation of her native Russia […] Collectively, (the essays) become one of the great political and cultural documents of our time, its continuity supplied by the wit and ardour of the writer, its freshness by the many disjunctions (Eder)
>
> …her perceptive essay […] is witty as well as perceptive […] The other essays and reviews in Tolstaya's new collection are equally humorous and pungent. (Bayley)

A final quality of the writing that endeared itself to the reviewers was the forthrightness of the opinions expressed:

> A bird's-eye perspective doesn't prevent her from swooping down for the occasional kill, and woe to those caught in her talons […] But Tolstaya, who bit her lip for decades under the Soviet regime […] emerged from its rubble as less of a kisser than a killer, and most of the fun here comes from seeing her rip subjects to shreds (Abramovich)
>
> Wielding her pen like a razor, Tolstaya shreds a multitude of shibboleths (Uhler)
>
> The author reflects on Russian culture and temperament with passion and conviction (Herman)

Thus in the reviews of Tolstaya's published works prior to 'The Slynx' there was universal approval and praise for the quality of her writing. It was only when the reviewers turned their attention to the subject matter of the themes explored in *Pushkin's Children* (and which also featured strongly in *The Slynx*) that signs of unease began to creep in.

2.3.4 The Themes of Literature, Sociology, Politics and Feminism

As would be expected from a work entitled 'Pushkin's Children', the legacy of Pushkin is a dominating feature of the eponymous central essay of the collection, as it also is of 'The Slynx'. The reviewers report Tolstaya's opinions in a neutral fashion:

> It's Tolstaya's observations about Russian literature that attract most attention…Internal freedom or social freedom, the poet or the citizen, art for art's sake or to improve society? …Tolstaya's preference for inner freedom seems clear. Pushkin was the only

> writer who dared to ask, “Whether it depends on the tsar or depends on the People – isn’t it all the same to you?” Pushkin’s “weighty words” gained new adherents during the silver age of Russian literature. Those works (largely preserved by Western publishers), as well as novels by Nabokov, penetrated the Soviet Union and kept Russia’s rich literary culture alive until Gorbachev’s glasnost (Uhler)
>
> In a sense all Russian writers are Pushkin’s children, and have inherited something of his inspired gaiety, which Tolstaya calls “inner freedom”. And yet, as she goes on to point out, the greatest Russian writers were the ones most afraid of it […] instead they voluntarily donned the fetters of moral duty. Pushkin alone […] dared to possess that inner freedom (Bayley)
>
> Tolstaya reveres Pushkin precisely because he stood above the "flat, pragmatic point of view" of the majority of Russian writers before and after him, who saw themselves as oracles and who "used the power of their words to address the most important social and political problems of their day" (Banville)

Tolstaya’s comments on the effect on literature of the removal of the restrictions of the Soviet era also attract the reviewers’ interest, with a warning that Tolstaya herself may be getting caught up in some of the less desirable practices of which she speaks:

> (Following) the time of Gorbachev’s glasnost […] with devastating abruptness “the word flooded the land” and, as Tolstaya points out in her drily comic way, (it) now took every conceivable form, good and bad, banal and obscene. It “lost its magical quality” (Bayley)
>
> In the title essay, however, a compressed but brilliant account of the effects of the fall of communism on Russian literature and its readers, she observes that after 1989 "the word, which had seemed unique and rare, was published in editions of millions and lost its magical qualities” (Banville)
>
> Tolstaya has written about the difficulty of being a Russian writer after 1991, trying to resume a literary tradition that was largely suppressed for 70 years. Post-Soviet literature, she writes in a 1992 essay, “starts everything anew, gets muddled and repeats itself in viscous, uncompliant words: it invents what was already invented long ago…” One can see Tolstaya falling into this trap, in more ways than one. On her native land: “Why is it that everything keeps mutating…the language, concepts,

> meaning! Huh? Russia! Everything gets twisted up in knots" (Blair)

The character of the Russian soul, one of the themes of her short stories, again featured in the essays and, as before, comments were favourable.

> She is also assailing what she sees as historical tendencies in the Russian soul, its rejection of reason, its "senselessness and mercilessness" […] She wrote of the "backward motion of history", of centuries of "government piracy, guile elevated to principle, unbridled caprice, extraordinary passivity and lack of will all combined with an impulsive cruelty… a blind superstitious belief in the spoken, and especially the written, word" (Kakutani)

> "…Russians – I remind readers for the umpteenth time – are not Europeans and especially not Americans". As if to counterbalance this sorry state of Russian affairs, Tolstaya speaks often and eloquently of Russia's inner life – the warmth of its "kitchen conversations", the strength of its "developed subculture of emotion" – and feels deeply for its hapless, hopeless and historically helpless inhabitants (Abramovich)

> She reserves her harshest words for Russia's intellectuals: "How many scornful pages have great Russian writers dedicated to Western pragmatism, materialism, rationalism! [...] As a result, in Russia we have neither machines, nor order, nor logic, nor money" (Uhler)

Much is made by the reviewers of Tolstaya's assessments and reassessments during the 1990s of the qualities of the Russian political leaders, and although the reviewers made no criticism of her changing her mind, there was some opinion voiced that towards the end of the decade she was losing touch, unable to grasp the enormities of the changes that had taken place in Russia

> The essays…are presented chronologically […] but this structure has the drawback of tracing Tolstaya's increasing inability to understand, and explain, the changes that have swept over Russia since 1991 […] As Russia grows inexplicable…these furiously engaged essays grow vague and nostalgic, and come to seem beside the point (Abramovich)

This reviewer goes as far as throwing back at Tolstaya a comment she made in 1991 about Gail Sheehy[1]: "You have to be quite fearless, an adventurer, extraordinarily self-assured, to offer American readers a book about a country that you yourself do not understand" (Tolstaya, 2003b: 27). Abramovich comments that the line has come back to haunt Tolstaya.

A last theme mentioned by a reviewer was the role of the woman in Russia and the attitude to Western feminism:

> She supplies a wonderful list of qualities to show that the Russian character is essentially feminine, while belittling foreign feminine complaints that the Russian woman is discouraged from pursuing a public career (Eder)

It was against this background – her literary skills recognised and widely admired, the soundness of her judgements on changes that had taken place in Russia during her absence not universally unquestioned in America – that Tolstaya returned to Russia in 1997 and finished a novel she had left uncompleted since 1986, the target audience being Russian readers and not American. The reaction of American reviewers to the translation published in 2003 is described next.

2.3.5. The Novel: *The Slynx*

It is to be expected that reviewers would approach a novel in a different way from a volume of short stories or a collection of essays and apply different standards to their assessment based in part on their subjective view as to what makes for merit and quality in that particular genre. As well as voicing their opinions, the reviewers gave a resume of the plot and some provided their readers with names of comparable works: Herman suggested *Fahrenheit 451* (Bradbury), *A Clockwork Orange* (Burgess) along with 'shades of Gogol and Nabokov', Eder listed *Animal Farm* (Orwell) and *Brave New World* (Huxley), Abramovich mentioned *A Canticle for Liebowitz* (Miller) and, again, *Fahrenheit 451* whilst for Kakutani the world of *The Slynx* was part *Mad Max*, part Kevin Costner's *Postman*.

[1] Author of *The Man Who Changed the World: The Lives of Mikhail S. Gorbachev* (1990)

The tone of some of the reviews held that the skills that Tolstaya brought so effectively to her earlier work do not automatically cross over with the same impact into the format of the novel, or even that Tolstaya's particular talents had been left behind:

> Worse, the very strengths of "Pushkin's Children" turn into faults when Tolstaya turns to fiction (Abramovich)
>
> Tolstaya's spirit and art are far better suited to accosting real people (Eder)
>
> What's curious about her first novel, "The Slynx", then, is that it displays none of its author's copious and varied gifts (Kakutani)

The reviewers in general took the book to be an allegory on the state of life both during the Soviet era and subsequently, with similar themes to those Tostaya had described in "Pushkin's Children", but some reviewers expressed unfavourable opinions as to its merit in the format of a novel:

> The world of "The Slynx" is standard-issue post-apocalyptic. What Ms. Tolstaya is doing of course is sending up conditions in post-Soviet Russia ... The problem is that "The Slynx" reads like a programmatic illustration of these ideas, rather than a work of fully imagined fiction (Kakutani)
>
> And that, dear reader, is that: an allegory so broad it applies to everything – and nothing. Instead of a fully formed fictional universe, we get a distorted image of Russian reality (Abramovich)

Reviewers also questioned whether an allegory was even appropriate given the changes that had recently taken place in Russia:

> While a simple allegory like Tolstaya's was once useful for conveying one big truth that no one could address directly, its potency is diminished in these days of relatively free speech. With its messy capitalist experiments, the current political reality in Russia is so contradictory and fascinating that this novel seems, more than anything, beside the point (Blair)

Another feature subject to uncomplimentary comments was the characterisations:

> She struggles to depict Benedikt as a villain: he's a cardboardy, fairy tale creature, all symbol with no flesh or bones (Kakutani)

> There are no real protagonists to whom tenderness can attach; only a series of grotesque masks performing a loosely assembled allegory (Eder)

> As in most allegorical and futuristic novels, including *1984* and *Brave New World,* the characters are robbed of substance by the bizarreries amongst which they must move and conduct their fitful lives. We simply do not care enough about these unfortunates, maimed and malformed as they are. Even Benedikt engages neither our full sympathy nor our full reprehension (Banville)

Among these reviews there was only one expression of empathy with any of the characters:

> The plight of the Oldeners in this alien landscape evokes an acute sense of longing and loneliness (Blair)

Evidence of subjective opinions was apparent regarding the wit and insight displayed by the author:

> Much of Tolstaya's wit and insight as a critic and commentator has found its way into her first novel (Bayley)

> "The Slynx" is a leaden-footed futuristic satire, quite devoid of wit and incisive insights (Kakutani)

Other comments focused on the complexities of the novel:

> Playful, maddening, penetrating and perplexing first novel [...] The essay collection is considerably more accessible than the novel, in which the reader can get bogged down by its allusive poetry, history, not to mention the author's linguistic dexterity […] Neither is it always clear how the gorgeous poetry included […] comes to bear on the central story line (Herman)

> It is impossible to communicate adequately the richness, the exuberance, and the horrid inventiveness of this book (Banville)

The way in which the novel rated as a work of fiction was considered, one theme being that the work as an allegory was not so much a tribute to Tolstaya's imagination as a collection of realities transferred to a fictional setting. Whether this was appropriate for a novel depended on the point of view of the reviewer:

> It defies Chekhov's famous rule that a good story should be free of "lengthy verbiage" of a "political-social-economic nature" (Kakutani)

> But "The Slynx" does intend to teach and to appeal, and, perhaps because Tolstaya has tried to channel Russia rather than herself, it fails on both counts (Abramovich)

> "The Slynx" is a retrospective dystopia and lacks the shiver of prophecy. Despite ingenious touches it is largely a series of coarse tableaus (Eder)

> One of Tolstaya's triumphs in the novel, predominately a stylistic one […] is to present a very odd and modernistically irrational tale as if it were a good, solid, and conservatively old-fashioned work of fiction (Bayley)

> As for the satire, one is required to be familiar with more than any Westerner could possibly know about the minutiae of Russian history and contemporary Russian life (Banville)

The American reviewers can be seen to have responded to the novel with less enthusiasm than to Tolstaya's previous work, and if there are consistent themes running through the reviews they relate to the relevance and suitability of the subject matter for the format of a novel, the lack of depth of the characters and the less than universal appreciation of the merits of the writing. The subjective comments used by the reviewers to sum up "The Slynx" reveal a much wider spectrum of opinion than the universal approval that greeted Tolstaya's earlier work: 'Ham-fisted and didactic tale' (Kakutani), 'The book feels slight' (Blair), 'A dark, morbid novel' (Uhler), 'Having read "Pushkin's Children" and turned to "The Slynx", you feel as if you're reading the very same book, translated into Middle English, perhaps, and back again' (Abramovich), 'It is a lovely heady ride. This vivid, puzzling, lively work […]

deserves to be experienced if not wholly or finally understood' (Herman). 'Despite all the energy and all the excitement, however, *The Slynx* is hard to love […] reading *The Slynx* is rather like finding oneself attending a theatrical performance in a foreign city where one knows the language but simply cannot get the jokes or the slang or the references' (Banville).

Only the last two reviewers among those in this analysis implied that there was more to the book than was readily apparent. For some of the others, "The Slynx" was just another novel of a particular type that did not quite stack up. The opinions could generally be taken as referring to the source text: mentions of the quality of the translation were sparse, as will be seen next.

2.3.6. Perceptions of the Translation

In the preceding overview of translation theory it was noted that comments made by reviewers in non-academic publications on the quality of a translation would normally relate to its acceptability in meeting the norms to which the reviewer works. It would not be expected that the adequacy of the translation would be brought into question, there being an implicit assumption that the translator had the skill to render an accurate understanding of the original work into the target text.

In the published reviews in this analysis, the two most explicit references to the translation were, firstly:

> The chapters are linked to the Russian ABCs, each getting a different letter, though one can't always be sure what they signify. Even with Jamey Gambrell's graceful translation there are some things that cannot make it across the Cyrillic barrier (Herman)

No justification is given for use of the word 'graceful'; the implication is that the reviewer's failure to fully comprehend all the intricacies is due to some of the source text being untranslatable and in no way to any deficiency on the part of the translator. The same reviewer later makes the comment (quoted above) about it not always being clear how the inclusion of the verse affects the story line. The second comment was:

> [*The Slynx*] must have been a nightmare to translate, and Jamey Gambrell has done a heroic job. Since the Blast, the Russian language has been in a process of decay, and in the translation a kind of Jabberwocky patters throughout the narrative (Banville)

Crediting the translator with 'a heroic job' would seem to be eminently fair. Although it passes no judgement on the effectiveness of the translation, the reviewer's comment (quoted above), that a deeper appreciation of matters Russian than any Westerner could ever acquire is required to understand the satire, implies that no translation could ever fully convey 'sense for sense' between the source and target texts. The reviewer later adds that, whereas the source text 'no doubt will have them splitting their sides in Moscow and St. Petersburg', the target text leaves the Western reader 'glum and stony-faced, wondering what all the laughter is about' (Banville).

The other reviews contain two brief compliments on the translation: "attentive translation" (Eder) and "very ably translated" (Bayley) without any reason being given for the particular judgements. From the other reviewers, nothing: a triumph for the invisibility of the translator. Of interest is an extract from a review that appeared in a provincial newspaper[1], particularly for what it says about the attitude of the reviewer to the translator.

> One of Jamey Gambrell's many headaches as a translator must have been how to render the Russian slang in English. The result is sometimes a bit odd, such as when an old Russian man says: "the whole shebang goes kaboom and blows to kingdom come." But overall the translation is dynamic, and I keep regretting not speaking Russian as it would have been fun to check Gambrell's version against the original to see how ingenious she'd been (Charbonneau)

Only one of the other reviewers (Banville) mentions the use of slang in the source text and implies that the target text has unusual features as it seeks to represent distorted language in the source text, although that reviewer does not go so far as indicating that the translation is 'odd'. Arguably, for the example in the quotation above, 'odd' is a more appropriate description than 'graceful'. What is interesting is

[1] Charbonneau, Jean in *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* (12/1/2003) (Charbonneau, 2003)

the assumption of the reviewer that the translator has been 'ingenious': not only does the reviewer fail to produce any evidence to support his case, he even admits that it would be impossible for him to do so. Were such an attitude to be prevalent amongst reviewers, this would be a licence for translators, in the words of Berman (quoted earlier in the comments about criticism), to 'get away with murder' (Berman, 1995).

It is instructive to contrast the above reviews with English-language reviews of the source text that appeared prior to publication of the translation, where the reviewers were not disadvantaged by any unfamiliarity with Russian history or current everyday life.

2.3.7. English-Language Reviews of the Russian Text

Two reviews are discussed in this section: a review by Nina Khrushcheva that appeared in the Times Literary Supplement on 5 October 2001 (Khrushcheva, 2001), an excerpt from which - "Tatyana Tolstaya's first novel has been hailed as a postmodern literary masterpiece…" - being used on the dust-cover of the translation, and a review by Anna Gessen placed by Harvard University Slavic Studies on their web-site in 2001 (Gessen, 2001). Both writers possess an expertise in Russian studies that would lead to their being expected to appreciate meanings in the source text that would not be apparent to a non-Russian (even were they to be able to understand the language). What are of particular interest in the present context are the items commented on by these reviewers that would also be expected to feature in the reviews of the translation but which, almost without exception, failed to appear. This could be attributed to self-censorship by the reviewers for whatever reason (e.g. lack of space) but could also point to a normalisation of the translation that made the book less remarkable in some key respect.

Khrushcheva is specific in naming who the various classes of people in the novel represent: 'the "degenerate" were urban *muzhiks* before the Explosion – that is, the Soviet proletariat' and 'the "formers" (our contemporary intelligentsia)'. She points out that:

> In this bizarre world, old symbols – "fire as a source of life", "fire of cleansing and rebirth", "light of knowledge", "candle of

> life", "alphabet of living", "food for the soul" – come to life. Metaphors become realities intertwined on various levels: structural, political, linguistic, cultural (Khrushcheva)

This is not an aspect of the book that one would expect a non-Russian to appreciate, and certainly it is not referred to in the reviews. However the next aspect of the source text is sufficiently distinctive that it could be expected that it would be represented in the target text:

> Tolstaya uses a stylistic form of *skaz* – first- or third-person colloquial narration of a legend – which allows her to interlard poetry, philosophy, Soviet-speak, peasant expressions, post-Communist Anglicisms and vulgarities (Khrushcheva)

The absence of any reference to this as a style of writing in the reviews leads to the suspicion of normalisation in the translation, to what Herman refers to, in a previous quotation, as a failure to cross a Cyrillic barrier. Given the rich source of linguistic material listed by Khrushcheva, the suspicion is that any normalisation of translation has stifled Tolstaya's acknowledged formidable wit, the lack of which was commented on in the reviews.

Gessen's review anticipates this very point:

> The greatest charm of Tolstaya's dystopian novel lies in its language, which is almost impossible to describe and completely impossible to translate […] Unlike Tolstaya's earlier work, which consisted of widely acclaimed short stories and essays studied in translation in American colleges, it is likely that whatever versions we get of *Kys'* in English will be pale imitations. The book may even be a disappointment to her American audience, as Tolstaya's transformation from the author of rather conventional, very feminine stories to the delightful wordplay of *Kys'* remains a mystery (Gessen)

One can feel sympathy for a translator with whom Tolstaya has collaborated so successfully in her 'very feminine stories' and is now faced with '*skaz*, traditionally considered a male domain […] (and) the formidable task of conveying the humour of Benedikt's remarkable combinations of semi-vulgar words with diminutive suffixes' (Gessen).

It does appear that, for some of the American reviewers, the charm of the language in the novel has not come across in the translation and, left with reviewing an allegory that seems to have no exceptional merit, they have not been so much disappointed as dismissive. What then can one say of the task of translating the source text? That the text is untranslatable? That it should be translated by a person well-equipped with humorous male vulgarities, ancient and modern, to spice up the language? Perhaps the problem lies with the target language, in that American-English is a modern form without the centuries of heritage from which the translator can pick (one thinks immediately of Chaucer as a suitable English-language source).

I will now turn to a recent development in the realm of translation studies, the use of the concordancer in conjunction with a prepared corpus, in order to examine methodically the specific difficulties the translator faced due to the use of *skaz* and distorted language in the source text, and the techniques that were used in preparing the target text.

2.3.8. Conclusion

The most striking feature of the reviews of the translation that appeared in American publications, some of which were decidedly unflattering, is the almost total lack of consideration given by the reviewers to the difficulties of translating the source text. The criticism was centred on assumed defects in the source text that, by implication, had been preserved by an adequate and acceptable translation. Those to whom the source text was accessible were able to make a more reasoned judgement.

Chapter 3: Analysis of *Кысь* and *The Slynx* at Lexical Level

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter has described some of the options available to the translator in preparing a target text, and in particular established that the norms of translation within which translators have to work will play a major influence on the finished product, as exemplified by *skopostheorie*. The criteria for basing any evaluation or criticism of a translation were seen to require an understanding of its purpose and its target audience: its success in meeting these requirements forms the framework within which its adequacy and acceptability can be assessed.

The reviews of the English-language translation *The Slynx* (Tolstaya, 2003a) were seen to have been mixed, but for the most part the quality of the translation received scant mention: by default, the target text was deemed to mirror the source text. It was established that this was by no means the whole story and that part of the reason for lukewarm criticism of the target text could lie with difficulties inherent in the language of the source text – to the extent that one observer even claimed the novel to be untranslatable.

Following an analysis of some of the peculiarities of the language in the source text, attention will be concentrated on the manner in which they are rendered by the translator. In order to carry out this task, the techniques of corpus analysis are utilised: such an approach has only recently become available as it depends on the capability to store and manipulate text in electronic format, and therefore the background theory is relatively new. An overview of the use of corpora in translation studies, giving examples of the type of achievable result relevant to this particular study, is provided before a project is introduced to analyse the translated features relating to unfamiliar occurrences in the source text. After a description of the methodology utilised, a sample of the results is analysed.

It is to be understood that my thesis relates to far more than just the language of the translation, and other aspects will be covered in the final two chapters. However the language is an issue: its examination is particularly amenable to modern corpus techniques and I believe the sample of the results clearly demonstrates this: I should make clear at this stage that a full analysis would produce a far larger project than is permissible for a dissertation of this type and that, although the data is available, it has not been attempted: such an in-depth analysis would simply have been impractical in the past, but whether its availability is welcome to the fraternity/sorority of translators can only be conjectured.

3.2. The Language of the Novel *Кысь*

The language of Tolstaya's novel *Кысь* by is partially invented, although it is based on the Russian language system. In large part it consists of a mixture of demotic speech, archaic and folkloric speech, slang, and jargon. This section will attempt an examination of the methods used by Tolstaya to create such a language, will try to gauge its effect on the structuring of the novel, using as it does the device of *остранение* which is the concept of 'defamiliarization' or 'making strange' whereby we are startled into a new way of seeing by a new way of saying things, as described by Shklovsky:

> 'Habitualization devours works, clothes, furniture, one's wife and the fear of war. 'If the whole complex lives of many people go on unconsciously, then such lives are as if they had never been.' And art exists that one may recover the sensation of life; it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone stony. The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived, and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar,' to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. In art, it is our experience of the process of construction that counts, not the finished product.' (Shklovsky 1995: 20)

In her journalistic articles, Tolstaya has written extensively on the need to preserve the beauty and complexity of the Russian language, and it has been argued that the

presentation of distorted language in the novel *Кысь* may represent to readers a plea that this be halted: 'but the new generation inclines towards a different variant of the Russian language, not so enchanting as the previous one, but perfectly suitable for simple communication. Its main manifestations are the dumbing-down of vocabulary in combination with verbal stumps'[1]. (Indeed, the critic Aleksandr Ageev goes as far as to accredit the single-word titles of Tolstaya's recent publications - *Кысь* (2000), *День* (2001), *Двое* (2002), *Изюм* (2002), *Ночь* (2003) and *Круг* (2003) - to her desire to highlight this very issue) (Ageev 2001).

This section will undertake an examination of those forms of demotic and colloquial speech which are prominent in the novel, different usage by different characters, and the distortion and word-building methods employed in its creation, including neologisms. Thereafter examples of 'Linguistic Exhibitionism' in Tolstaya's prose will be examined, including her use of puns, onomatopoeia, rhythm itself and other wordplay. Throughout, the original will be compared to the translation and comment provided on the methodology and effect of the translation, relating this to the review of translation theory already outlined.

3.2.1. Demotic Speech

Offord (2000 [1996]:9) defines demotic speech as 'popular speech', being below the normal register of colloquial speech and being the 'spontaneous, informal speech of the uneducated', elements of which would sound discordant in even normal colloquial speech and in educated speech. According to Offord such speech 'observes no norms'. For L.A. Kapanadze such speech is *бесьменно*, i.e. 'having no written language' and being reflective of oral tradition, or more precisely 'the equivalent of an illiterate letter':

> Книжный эквивалент просторечия – безграмотное письмо человека, не знакомого с эпистолярными жанрами

[1] [1] «На липовой ноге» in *День* (Tolstaya 2001: 354-360) with an abridged English version entitled 'Russia's Language is in the Soup', Project Syndicate, July 2002, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/tolstaya2 (accessed 23/1/07). See further «Надежда и опора» (ibid: 349-354).

> литературного языка. Однако здесь мы не может (так!) говорить о каком-то новом виде просторечия, так как на письме не появляются ни новые синтаксические конструкции, ни специфические формы речи, неизвестные устной традиции (Zemskaia and Shmelev (eds.)1984: 8).

> The bookish equivalent of popular speech would be an illiterate letter by someone ignorant of the epistolary genres of the literary language. However, here we are not talking about some kind of new aspect of popular speech, since neither new syntactical constructions, nor specific forms of speech unfamiliar to the oral tradition are evident (ibid, trans. LCK).

Unlike other registers of standard speech, demotic speech does not conform to any norms, with numerous distortions being recognisable within morphology and syntax and at phonetic and lexical level. Kapanadze comments further that dictionary entries of such language look' inconsistent' or 'discrepant' and it is this very 'non-uniformity' of the category of speech which lies at the heart of it. (ibid: 9)

After the Explosion everything in Fedor-Kuz'mich was damaged, people, animals, and nature. People had to survive by accepting the degradation of eating mice and worms. Two main groups emerged – those characters in the novel who have been alive for more than 300 years: *перерожденцы*, translated as 'degenerators' and the *прежние* translated as 'oldeners' and a second group consisting of all the other inhabitants, namely the *голубчики* 'golubchiks' and *кохинорцы* 'cockynorks', who were born after the Explosion. Sorych (2004: 4) points out that the *перерожденцы* and *прежние*, the *голубчики* and the *кохинорцы* all have their own language, the language of the cockynorks not being understood at all by the inhabitants of Fedor-Kuz'mich and that the *прежние* and *голубчики* understand each other scarcely better.

> А после матушкиной смерти Никита Иваныч не то чтобы что, а вроде как молчать больше начал, людей сторониться. Оно понятное дело: Прежних, почитай, и нет почти, разве что перерожденцы, да они вроде как и не люди, а с нонешними голубчиками, с нами, то есть, того разговору уж

не заведешь. Да и то сказать: Прежние наших слов не понимают, а мы ихних.

А почему кинешь, потому как кохинорцы эти не по-нашему говорят. Бал-бал-бал да бал-бал-бал, - да и все тут, да и ничего не разберешь. А почему они так говорят, почему по-нашему не хотят, - кто ж их знает. Может, назло. А может привычка такая вредная, это тоже бывает.

А и то сказать, сами себе вредят. Что они там по-кохинорски-то сказать могут? По-нашему куда сподручней: сел, рассудил не спеша: вот так, дескать, и так; это вот и то-то. И все ясно.

А эти - вот поди ж ты, уперлись и все тут. Ну а кто говорит, что им просто носы мешают; дескать, они бы и рады сесть да побеседовать по-нашему, да вот носы. Носы у них до полу, - право, смех один. Такое у них Последствие (ibid:)

We can see that mostly all the inhabitants of Fedor-Kuzmich speak in demotic style, with the exception of the 'oldeners', who clearly depict the Russian intelligentsia.

The 'golubchiks' use language which can be seen to have dialect at its root, and elements of dialect will be seen to be present in the phonetics, morphology, phraseology, syntax and lexicology of the novel.

The 'degenerators', who have lived as long as the 'oldeners' but are significantly different from them, speak in another type of demotic speech, which can be seen to be a type of jargon or sociolect typified by the taxi-driver which we have already touched upon, and will return to discuss at a later stage.

As we will see, the meaning of many words and concepts used by the 'oldeners' – particularly abstract or philosophical categories of words such as 'university', 'education', 'intelligentsia', 'the Renaissance', 'philosophy' as well as words signifying technological advance, such as 'weapons' and 'asphalt' and words of cultural significance – 'shops', 'museum', 'David', 'honey' - have all become alien and lost to the 'golubchiks', and this ignorance was highlighted by Benedikt's distorted representations to himself: e.g.

ОНЕВЕРСТЕЦКОЕ АБРАЗАВАНИЕ (УНИВЕРСИТЕТСКОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ)
МОГОЗИНЫ (МАГАЗИНЫ)
ОСФАЛЬТОМ (АСФАЛЬТОМ)
ЭНТЕЛЕГЕНЦЫИ (ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИЯ)
ТРОДИЦЫЮ (ТРАДИЦИЮ)
РИНИСАНСА (РЕНЕССАНС)
МЕТ (МЁД)
ШАДЕВРЫ (ШЕДЕВРЫ)
МОЗЕЙ (МУЗЕЙ)
ФЕЛОСОФИЯ (ФИЛОСОФИЯ)

In the above examples, we see that it is also possible not only to imitate demotic speech, but also to create artificial versions using as model the normal forms of declension, thus increasing the sense of *остранение* for the reader. The fourth item is particularly interesting as it not only dissimilates vowels but creates a new word from the replacement of the feminine noun suffix *ия* with the adjectival ending *ый*. Thus the contrast between base and ending is unexpected.

An attempt will be made to single out and analyse those features of language in the novel that focus on Tolstaya's use of demotic speech, professional jargon, archaisms and neologisms, and the general effects of *разноречие* or polyphony thus created, without which, according to Bakhtin, a stylistic analysis of the novel cannot be productive[1]. It should also be noted that there is a great amount of humour threaded throughout the novel, some created through the art of *стёб* ('styob' or 'mickey-taking') directed at official and professional jargon, such 'mickey-taking' being a way of dismantling the clichés of новояз ('novoyaz', the Russian version of Orwell's newspeak) (Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade 1999: 322/4). Thus modern discourse can subvert and reject the language code of the past through irony, wordplay and parody (Ryazanova-Clarke 2002).

[1] See further Bakhtin, M Discourse in the Novel (1981:263) in The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays (ed. M. Holquist, trans. Holquist M and Emerson, C). Bakhtin stress the 'internal stratification' of a language into: 'social dialects, characteristic group behaviour, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific socio-political purposes of the day, even of the hour.'

As stated before, Tolstaya is very much concerned about the loss of richness of the Russian language, and an obvious example of this would be the forms of address adopted in the novel where the colloquial terms *голубчик* (golubchik) , 'darling, good fellow' (m) and *голубушка* (golubushka), 'darling, dear lady' are used as a parody of the Soviet terms of address *товарищ* 'tovarishch' or 'comrade' and *гражданин* 'citizen' (m) and *гражданка* 'citizenness'[1]. The latter terms emerge as a calque of the title citoyen/citoyenne 'citizen' introduced in the French Revolution as a general form of address expressing equality (Comrie, Stone and Polinsky 1996: 275).

Whilst agreeing that Tolstaya's novel can certainly be analysed as a postmodernist text, it will be suggested that such a text need not preclude levels of passion and emotion, but indeed that the differences between it and the 'realist' or 'socialist realist' texts can be drawn from its focus on self-consciousness and self-referentiality, wherein the very foregrounding of language and stylistic elements, open-ended narratives, the blurring of the boundaries between fiction and reality, parody, multiplicity of narrative levels all find strong representation.

As we have seen postmodernist writing distinguishes itself largely on the basis of stylistic innovation and rejection of the formal strictures of earlier times. The most evident strategy of Russian postmodern writers is therefore linguistic exhibitionism (Kolesnikoff 2001:89-100) when rare, highly conspicuous words are employed which emphasise the constructed nature of the text. While a tendency to neglect such stylistic nuances of the text in favour of conveying the plot and normalizing the diction will of course lead to a devaluing of the translation, I will attempt to show that an overly 'faithful' reproduction of such devices in translation is not, in fact, always a successful

[1] See further Formanovskaia (1989): '*Товарищ* starts out as the title expressing solidarity and is so used in the pre-Revolutionary and early post-Revolutionary years. At this same period, the use of *гражданин* as a neutral title is necessitated. The complete intolerance to political dissent in the 1920s-30s affects *товарищ* in that it begins to be used as a marker of ideological loyalty […] the desemantization of *товарищ* is characteristic of the 1950s-1970s; by the late 1980s, the growing disillusionment with Soviet history stigmatises this word' (in Comrie, Stone and Polinsky 1996: 279).

strategy and will argue that something more than a constant veering between domestication and foreignisation is required.

In this section a detailed examination of particular characteristics of demotic speech as identified by L A Kapanadze (in Zemskaya and Shmelev, 1984:126-7) will be undertaken in an effort to pinpoint those elements used by Tolstaya to produce the effect of oral speech in the novel. Using a corpus built up using the 'Wordsmith' computer programme and the methodology to be described in 3.4., detailed comparisons with the English translation are possible, allowing us to shed light on patterns and their translation equivalents. The primary intention of such detailed examination is of course to offer insight into the morphology and syntax of the novel, but no less to examine the challenges and limits of translation.

The use of colloquial and demotic speech gives a definite sense of someone telling a story, someone who is in command of the local idiom and understands the characters' milieu. Such usage underlines the narrator's presence and establishes a direct avenue of contact with the audience that a more objective narration lacks. The use of slang, folk idioms and peasant dialect with oral-type constructions sends a direct signal to the reader and can elicit the desired emotion, such as sympathy or humour.

3.2.2. The Personal Narrator

Colloquial language has evolved a whole system of means of expressing subjective elements at different language levels, and where emotive-expressive nuances are involved these can be represented by particles, - short, sometimes inconspicuous words with quite specific meanings in turn often difficult to define and fulfilling a wide variety of functions. Such particles add specific colouring to the individual's speech and lend it a wealth of emotive-expressive shades, vividness, richness, spontaneity and sometimes 'sly merriment, meaningful connotations etc' (Vasilyeva: 6).

Many particles add different shades of meaning depending on their position in the sentence and one and the same sentence containing the same particles may be

pronounced with different intonation which also alters the meaning of the utterance. Finally, various particles may occur in different combinations in one and the same sentence, producing new and more complex fusions of semantic and emotive-expressive shades. Sometimes particles can make up special phrases which depending on the context and intonation may express surprise, disappointment, chagrin, disagreement, bewilderment, irony etc. The eminent Soviet linguist and Academician V.V.Vinogradov defined such particles as 'classes of those words which, as a rule, have no completely independent real, or material, meaning, but for the most part introduce additional shades into the meanings of other words, phrases or sentences, or are used to express all kinds of grammatical (and, consequently, logical and expressive) relation. The lexical meaning of these words corresponds with their grammatical, logical, stylistic and expressive functions. Therefore, the semantic range of particles is extremely wide, their lexical and grammatical meanings are very flexible, and they are at the mercy of their syntactical use' (Vinogradov 1947:663).

Such filler words abound in human speech serve to increase the richness of the telling, suggesting human voices and allows them to interact and interpenetrate one another's spheres. As a literary device, they are used to set up layer upon layer of meaning within the narration and between narrator, character and reader. In many cases translators tend to consider semantics first and the frequent tendency to remove redundancies and repetitions leads to an almost complete levelling of narrative style.

All too predictably in translation, colloquial language becomes more standard, interjections and other interferences disappear, and interior monologue loses its immediacy. According to May, this tendency is the result of 'clashing cultural attitudes toward narrative style in the original and target languages' and 'an internal struggle between translator and narrator for control of the text's language.

3.2.3. Sociolects

As well as the demotic speech spoken by the Benedikt and the Golubchiks, the educated speech spoken by the Former Ones, and the governmental voice of authority parodied in the four decrees issued in Fedor-Kuz'mich, it is also possible to detect the language of the profession in the utterances of Teterya Petrovich, a member of the *перерожденцы* ('degenerators') who fulfil the equivalent role of modern-day taxi-drivers. As well as swearing and making crude comments about passing women, this group are portrayed as rude and unhelpful:

> Давно ли пешком ходил, шеф? (R:201)
> "Been a long time since you walked, eh, chief?" (E:143)

Petrovich addresses Benedikt using the familiar 2nd person form of the verb *ходил* despite the fact that the latter is his boss (шеф). The contrast between two therefore produces a humorous effect.

When Benedikt asks where Terenty Petrovich thinks he's going, the answer comes swiftly, as a wry comment on the helpfulness of taxi-drivers in the former Soviet Union:

> А мне в парк!.. (R:201))
> Back to the garage. I'm off duty!" (E:143)

In contrast with the Russian, which is brief and off-hand, signalling the speaker's couldn't-care-less attitude, the English translation uses explicitation of the words 'I'm off duty' to 'show' the reader just what is meant.

A further example of a sociolect at work can be discerned in the 'questioning' sessions Benedikt endures at the hands of his father-in-law, who plays a role in the novel equivalent to the Head of the KGB, or secret police. Benedikt tells that he *поучать любит, али вопросы задавать, вроде как проверяет* (likes to ask questions, almost as if he's checking up):

- Ну что, зять, мыслей каких не завелось?	"So, how about it, son, no thoughts popping up?"
- Каких мыслей?	"What thoughts?"
- Мыслей всяких нехороших?	"All kinds of bad thoughts?"
- Не завелось.	"No, nothing popping up."
- А если подумать?	"Think about it carefully."
- И думать не могу. Объелся.	"I can't think. I'm stuffed."
- Может, на злодейство тянет?	"Maybe you feel like committing some villainy?"
- Не тянет.	"No, I don't."
- А если подумать?	"But if you think about it?"
- Все равно не тянет.	"I still don't."
- Может, смертоубийство какое задумал?	"Maybe you've planned some homicide?"
- Нет.	"No."
- А если подумать?	"But if you think about it?"
- Нет.	"No."
- А если по-честному?	"If you're honest about it?"
- Да что вы, ей-Богу! Ну сказал же: нет!	"For heaven's sake, I told you. No!"
- А начальство сковырнуть не мечтается?	"No dreams of overthrowing the bosses?"
- Слушайте, я спать пойду! Я не могу так!	"Listen, I'm going to sleep! I can't take this!"
- А если во сне мечты какие душегубные придут?.... (R: 204/5)	"And what if you have some murderous dreams?" (E:144-5)

In this exchange we can clearly see the work of the police interrogator at work. Benedikt's answers are almost incidental to the aim of the conversation – to extract confession. An interesting use is made in the Russian of the adjective *душегубные* here, which is not really reflected in the English translation. The word is defined as belonging to 'popular speech' in pre-war dictionaries (Ushakov:1935) and has its roots in the word *душегубство* meaning 'murder'. In Soviet dictionaries after WWII however, we find the addition of the derivative word *душегубка* with the meaning of a 'mobile gas chamber' as operated by the Nazis - *фашистский автомобиль для умерщвления людей газом* - (Ozhegov: 1978), a more sinister connotation not evoked in the translation. Gambrell's choice of 'homicide' is certainly less forceful to a British readership, for whom homicide may be known to be 'justifiable' or 'excusable' as well as 'felonious' in law. The English translation may wish to avoid a colloquial translation such as 'dreams

of snuffing someone out' in order to avoid evocation of such heinous WWII practices against Jewish people.

3.3. Corpora in Translation Studies

The development of computer technology enabling text to be stored electronically and analysed by means of specialist software has led to the availability of the important linguistic tool of the corpus, a collection of electronically formatted texts specifically selected to meet the needs of the analyst. In the UK the largest such collection is the British National Corpus (BNC), first published in 1994, consisting of a 100 million word reference of texts chosen as representative of British English language at the present time (available at www-dev.natcorp.ox.ac.uk). The corpus is made up of subsections such as the BNCFIC, the sub-corpus consisting of imaginative writing. The availability of such a large corpus enables generalisations about occurrences of different forms of language use to be made; typically, corpus linguistics is interested in 'what is likely to occur in language use' (Kennedy 1998: 7-10). The computer software facilitates quantitative research and is particularly suited for hypothesis testing based on language as it is actually used, since it is now feasible to work with and manipulate large volumes of text.

Translations are excluded from the BNC which 'would indicate that they are not considered as representing language use, in English-speaking contexts at least' (Olohan 2004:13). However the use of corpora has become well-established in translation studies as a tool with two main purposes. Firstly, in order to describe language as it is used in the process of translation, reference is made to a corpus of original texts in one language combined with the corresponding translated texts in another language, known as a *parallel corpus*. A second aim, to analyse translations as they exist, requires a different corpus, one that consists of original texts in a language and translated texts into the same language, known as a *comparable corpus*. No reference to the source texts of the translations is included in such a corpus.

Looking first at the construction of parallel corpora, it is clear that this depends on the availability of texts and their translations. Before computer software can be used to retrieve data of interest to the analyst, the sets of two texts (originals and translations) have to be aligned, linking units of text in the original with the corresponding units in the translation. Parallel corpora permit contrastive studies into the lexical and syntactic features of source texts compared to translations, enabling translated texts to be checked for lexical *normalisation* (creative or unusual source language translated using more conventional lexis in the target language) and lexical or syntactic *simplification* (e.g. a smaller range of vocabulary, shorter sentence lengths etc. in the translation compared to the source text). *Explicitation* (information introduced into the target language that is present only implicitly in the source language) can also be analysed: it may be obligatory (e.g. including definite articles when translating from Russian into English), deliberately pragmatic on the part of the translator or non-deliberate or (hypothetically) an inherent part of the translation process. Choices made by translators will be influenced by the *genre* of the original (this refers to the conventionalised form of the text, e.g. novel, biography, instruction manual etc.) and by the types of attitudinal expression featuring in the language of the original text. The use of parallel corpora in contrastive linguistic studies has evolved so that 'often relatively little interest is shown in the translation process and activity; the translations in the corpus are considered first and foremost a reflection of the possibilities offered by the target language system' (ibid.: 24).

Two particular examples given by Olohan are relevant to the project at the end of this chapter. The first is of two different translations of the same original text which are analysed in an attempt to uncover evidence of the translator's voice. Bosseaux (2001) compares two translations into French of Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*, and shows that one translation emphasizes foreignness in the target text whilst the other tends to remove cultural specificity (Olohan 2004: 33). The second example is of translations into English of German-language texts of an 'experimental' nature (Kenny 2001: 115) which feature creative word forms that are invented and/or used by a single writer: such words were extracted from a corpus by constructing a list of hapax legomena, i.e. word forms that occur only once in the corpus. Kenny's research (ibid.: 142-188) shows that whilst

unusual derived forms and creative verbal nouns tended to be translated using more conventional lexis, this was less the case for creative compounds (Olohan 2004: 31)

Much corpus-based analysis of translation has developed from the ideas introduced by Baker when she stated that 'we need to explore how text introduced in relative freedom […] differs from text produced under the normal conditions which pertain in translation' (Baker 1995: 233). In order to carry out such a project it would be necessary to consult 'two separate collections of texts in the same language: one corpus consists of original texts in the language in question and the other consists of translations in that language' (ibid.: 234), in other words what is now known as a comparable corpus. Such a corpus could be used to test hypotheses that translations as a matter of course feature *explicitation* (they tend to be more explicit on a number of levels than non-translated texts), *simplification* (their content or form is simplified compared with non-translated texts) and *normalisation* (their use of language is more conventional than non-translated texts). If universal features of translations could be confirmed they would support the notion of translation being a 'third code' of language in the way described in the previous Chapter on Translation Theory. A further use of the comparable corpus as proposed by Baker (2000) is in the analysis of the style of individual translators, where style is defined as 'a kind of thumbprint that is expressed in a range of linguistic- as well as non-linguistic – features' (ibid.: 245) which can involve choice of material to translate, interventions through paratexts etc., although Baker prioritises the 'characteristic use of language' and the 'individual profile of linguistic habits, compared to other translators' (ibid). A qualification must be born in mind: as a consequence of editorial intervention 'the text of a translation is rarely all the translator's own work' (Fawcett 1995: 189) and 'translations of literary texts are likely to undergo more rigorous editing than their corresponding source novels did' (Olohan 2004:153). The use of comparable corpora can also be extended to an investigation into whether translations follow norms, i.e. do they meet the expectations of particular translations in particular contexts (ibid: 20) and also to consider more theoretical propositions such as whether there is any justification for the notion of universals, i.e. laws of translation (such as the 'third code') which affect all translations regardless of source and target languages, context, genre etc. As Toury

(1995: 265) says, 'the quest for laws would have to take into full consideration regularities of actual behaviour obtained by an ever-growing (and ever more variegated) series of studies into well-defined corpuses', to which Olohan (2004: 20) adds 'it is generally accepted that corpus-based studies will reveal the kind of 'regularities of actual behaviour' referred to by Toury, which may be evidence of conformance, or otherwise, to certain norms of translation. And if the frequent and typical can be studied, so can the unusual'.

The first comparable corpus, developed in the mid-1990s, was the Translational English Corpus (TEC), usually used with a set of English-language texts from the BNC as the comparable element. The TEC consists of a corpus of translations in English from a range of different source languages divided into four text categories: biography, fiction, newspaper texts and in-flight magazines, of which over 80% comprises fiction, containing in total something under 10 million words (texts are continually being added). The subjectivity of decision-making regarding the material to be included in such a corpus is a problem: 'indeed, since the overarching aim of most corpus-based investigations of translation is to learn something about some aspect of translators' behaviour, the question of representativeness extends beyond whether certain texts are representative of a certain genre to whether certain translations are representative of translational behaviour' (Olohan 2004: 47).

In order for the computer software designed to analyse the corpus to function, it is necessary for texts to be converted into Unicode text format: they can then, if desired, be 'reclothed' by adding tags[1]. The basic computer software tool designed for extracting selected data from a corpus is the concordancer; the user enters a search word (also called node or key-word) and the display shows each instance of that word appearing with a small amount of text (known as the co-text) either side of it, making up the 'concordance

[1] The most usual form of tag is part-of-speech (POS) tagging. It is important that corpus texts to be shared or made available on the Internet are tagged to recognised standards: the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) is an international consortium responsible for producing mark-up standards (available at www.tei-c.org).

line' which can then be sorted e.g. alphabetically by the word of co-text either to the left or to the right of the key-word. Some concordancers accommodate searches based on tags or combinations of tags and lexical items. Examples of the quantitative measures that can be produced from a corpus are the frequency list (the number of occurrences of each word in a corpus in decreasing order, starting with the most common), the type-token ratio which is an indication of lexical diversity (type refers to the number of different words in a corpus, token to the total number of words), word length, sentence length, paragraph length, lexical density (a measure of the proportion of lexical or content words to grammatical or function words), the keyword list (a comparison of the frequency lists of a large general corpus with a smaller corpus identifies words higher up the frequency list of the latter) and collocations (the likelihood of co-occurrence of lexical items within a user-specified collocation horizon, commonly five words to the left and five to the right) including semantic prosody (the kinds of meaning a grouping of words acquires by virtue of being used together). Although the results of the quantitative measures can be used as supporting evidence in any qualitative evaluation, it must nevertheless be appreciated that this approach has strict limitations and other factors influencing the translation which cannot be ascertained as the result of a simple data capture and counting exercise need to be fully appreciated for a measured qualitative assessment to be produced.

One of the first large-scale empirical studies using comparable corpora was to analyse the optional use of the word *that* following the reporting verbs *say* and *tell* (Olohan and Baker 2000)[1]. Baker was able to extend this research into her study of translator style (Baker 2000a)[2], but as she herself points out, any results so obtained may reflect aspects of translator's style in evidence to meet a particular requirement, such as the need for the translator to mediate texts in order to try 'to promote a literature and culture widely

[1] This study showed clearly a more frequent use of *that* in the TEC than the BNC, an example of explicitation in translation (Olohan and Baker 2000).

[2] Baker compared the translations held in the TEC of two translators, one of whom was found to use *that* in line with the patterning of original English while the other followed the 'normal' patterning of translated English, 'interesting given that the option of deleting the equivalent of 'that' is equally unavailable in all the source languages involved […], so there is no question of source language influence here as far as I can see' (Baker 2000a: 257).

viewed as more 'alien' and associated with all kinds of negative stereotypes in the world of his English-speaking readers' (ibid.: 259). As Olohan comments, 'the most fruitful avenue to pursue […] may be to analyse texts written by the translators that are not translations' (Olohan 2004: 150) in order to obtain a complete comparison of style..

Researchers using comparable corpora would not claim to be attempting to ignore the source text or language entirely but rather to be treating it in much the same way as other factors likely to have exerted an influence on the translation process. Overall findings can be analysed in terms of source language if required, but it is the case that in general translation scholars' attention has shifted from viewing translation in its relationship with a source text to viewing translation as a text in its own right: some even claim that "the source language, once the sovereign of translation theory and now little more than a tiresome interloper and a perennial nuisance, consistently eluding the clutches of tidy theories and neat taxonomies, has - at least for the present - been dethroned" (Stewart 2000: 208-9). On the other hand, Kenny has shown that it is possible to make constructive use of results of research obtained from a comparable corpus and test them in a parallel corpus environment (Kenny 2005)[1]. Kenny argues that "source texts can indeed be integrated into research programmes more normally associated with target-oriented comparable corpora" (ibid: 162).

A merging of the target-oriented approach of comparable corpus work with the possibilities offered by parallel corpora is the approach to be adopted by this dissertation. Against this background, the second part of this chapter establishes the aims of a project

[1] Kenny has taken the results of the Olohan and Baker (2000) investigation referred to above into the inclusion of *that* in English translations and related them to a parallel corpus of German texts and their translations into English (the point being that use of the German equivalent word *daß* is also optional). She finds that in this corpus the rates of inclusion/ omission of *that* in the English translations are similar to those found by Olohan and Baker (ibid) in the TEC; on examining the link with the German source texts, the inclusion of *that* in English coincides with use of the optional German word approximately half the time, suggesting explicitation, but in an average of only one case in five did translators replace *daß* with a zero-connective, suggesting a lack of implicitation.

using the techniques of corpus analysis and explains the associated methodology designed to achieve the required result.

3.4. Translation of Unusual Forms: Project Aims and Methodology

The aim of the project is to pick out various types of unusual/invented lexical and syntactic forms from the Russian-language original of *Кысь* (Tolstaya 2000) and analyse their translations into English in *The Slynx* (Tolstaya 2003a). In the previous chapter it has been noted that translators faced with rendering such a piece of text may approach the problem in various ways, for example inventing a word in the target language, leaving the source text untranslated, producing a normalised text or straight omission. One of the capabilities of the corpus approach is that it enables the researcher to establish where the source text uses the same form of wording at various points scattered through the corpus, and to see whether the target text is consistent in its approach to the translation. The fact that the reviews of the translation made virtually no comment on its lexical intricacies suggests that normalisation could be in evidence, something that would go unnoticed by a reviewer without access to the source text.

Despite the advantages of the technological developments of recent years the methodology required a great deal of tedious extraction of data in order to produce the required concordances. One enormous advantage is that Tolstaya has placed the original text of *Кысь* on the Internet[1], and therefore the first part of the project, picking out the unusual forms from the source text, could be carried out directly using methods of corpus research specially geared to the particular requirements, as described below. However for the second part of the project relating to the translations, the target text not being available in electronic format necessitated the scanning of the entire translated text, using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software to store the documents in Microsoft Word format.

[1] available at http://lib.ru/PROZA/TOLSTAYA/kys.txt

One approach to finding the unusual/invented lexical forms would be the hapax legomena method used for the experimental German texts (Kenny 2001) but by definition this will not pick up word forms that are repeated (the title *Кысь* being an obvious example). Therefore an alternative approach was taken, making use of the Spell Check tool in the Microsoft Word software program, which checks text against a dictionary and grammatical standards, underlining unrecognised lexis in red and ungrammatical syntax in green. The program features default settings for both the dictionary and grammatical standards, and these were used in the project. The Russian text was copied into the Word program and the Russian-language Spell Check tool was run. As a result, several hundred occurrences of unrecognised lexis and syntax were underlined: these were copied into lists and, following a manual inspection, the most relevant examples subdivided into five groups: mutated nouns, mutated verbs, mutated adjectives/adverbs, interjections/onomatopoeia and invented words.

The next step was to run the Wordsmith concordancer (Scott, 1997), using the entire Russian text as the basic document and each of the five groups separately as a file of key-words. As a result, five lists of concordance lines containing all occurrences of the key-words were produced (a total of some 1,600 concordance lines)[1].

In order to analyse the translation of the relevant parts of each concordance line, a parallel corpus was prepared using the Russian text and the scanned English translation. The alignment was performed paragraph against paragraph, considerably aided by the paragraph structure of the translation exactly following that of the original in all but a very few instances. Word counts for each page of the corpus were noted for both languages. Within the parallel corpus, the Russian-language concordance lines could then be identified with the help of the word count. The translated text (or indeed lack of any direct translation) could then be searched for in the corresponding translation. The resulting list of enhanced concordance lines including translations were stored in Excel, enabling them to be sorted by word order or alphabetically by Russian keyword. As

[1] Wordsmith identifies the word count of each occurrence which aids subsequent retrieval of the concordances from the source text.

noted before, of particular interest was the use several times over in the Russian source text of certain word forms where the translator had varied her approach according to context.

3.5. Translation of Unusual Forms: Results

As described above, the data for the project consists of about 1,600 Concordance lines with key-words being specially selected word forms of five types: mutated nouns, mutated verbs, mutated adjectives/adverbs, interjections/onomatopoeia and invented words. Along with the Russian co-text, there are a few words of the English translation of the key-word's immediate surroundings. The following is therefore an example of a Concordance line:

Co-text	Key-word	Word count	Type	Translation
синим песком натрешь, - все-то я рученьки пообломала, надрываючись. А ему, вишь, доблесть одна. Потом вся деревня на него смотреть ходила. Кто и опасалс	Вишь	1873	verb	And for him, it's all glory.

3.5.1.Analysis of Nouns

Our task here is to show by what means and devices wordplay is heavily characteristic of Russian colloquial speech. Wordplay in language can be viewed as the realisation of the poetic function of language, in that, in using play, the speaker directs attention to the form of speech (Jakobson: Linguistics and Poetics). Tolstaya has created a number of neologisms in the text and in the main it can be seen that most of the names belong to plants and animals whose names have been lost as a result of the Explosion:

кы-ы-ысь	и плачет, и жалуется: кы-ы-ысь! кы-ы-ысь! (R: 191)	crying and whining: Sssllyyynxxx! Slyyynxxx! (E: 135)

The first word in the book immediately has the effect on the reader of being known, but not-quite-known. Carrying echoes of *кис-кис* (puss-puss! {to a cat}) *рысь* (a lynx) *брысь* (shoo! {to a cat}) *крыса* (a rat) and *Русь* (Rus') the image of cat-like menace is

already conjured up and the reader is intrigued by the suggestion of a tale of old Rus'. Further intrigue is stirred by the orthographical incompatibility of the letter *ы* after the consonant *к* breaks the spelling rule of using *и*.

The English translation of the title by the word 'Slynx' adequately captures the stealth and sensuousness of the 'big cat' image, but rather fails when used onomatopoeically as the example above demonstrates, since the word does not lend itself to a mimetic representation of an animal sound.

Вертизубку	Я даже рыбку-вертизубку ведром поймал. (R: 13)	I even caught a whirlytooth fish in a bucket.(E: 7)

According to research carried out by Ulyana Sorych, the name of this fish may be the result of altering an existing word in the Russian language, i.e. *вырезуб*, which is listed in *Dal'* and which is found in the Rivers Voronezh and Don (Sorych 2004). The fish is given in *Dal'* as *Cyprinus dentex*, a fish which is a member of the carp family, typically with barbels or filaments around its mouth (OED). The new word is built by substituting the stem of the verb *верт-еть* 'to turn' and using the imperative *верт-и* + diminutive noun from *зуб* 'tooth'. The English translation is therefore similarly and appropriately built, using an adjective ('whirly' from the verb 'to whirl') + noun model.

Клель	Клель - самое лучшее дерево. (R: 17)	Elfir is the best tree (E: 10)

This word is built using a syllabic abbreviation + full noun model. The first syllable of the word derives from the first syllable of the word *клён* a 'maple tree' and the full noun *ель*, 'a fir tree': *кл+ель*. The translation in English takes the first two letters of the existing Russian noun *ель* and adds the English word 'fir', to create 'elfir'. There is no visible translation loss in losing the reference to the maple tree.

Дубельт	Дубельт (R: 171)	Beriawood (E: 121)

The word *Дубельт* is used in reference to the wooden log from which Benedikt is about to sculpt the Pushkin figure. Benedikt uses a word he imagines to be *Дуб*, an oak

tree. Unfortunately his distorted version of the word coincides with the name of a former Assistant head of the Political Police during the reign of Tsar Nicholas 1 - General L.V. Dubelt. Associating Pushkin with such a figure inevitably provokes rage in Nikita Ivanovich. The English translation clearly feels that Dubelt is too remote a figure to have resonance with contemporary American readers, and so the name of Lavrentii Beria, head of the secret police, then called the Ministry of Internal Affairs, during Stalin's rule is substituted, to produce 'beriawood'.

Прежние	Прежние наших слов не понимают, а мы ихних. (R: 31)	the Oldeners don't understand our words, and we don't understand theirs (E: 20)

The people whom Tolstaya has named the *Прежние*, literally 'the former ones' from the adjective *прежний* – 'previous or former' are obviously synonymous with the Russian pre-revolutionary intelligentsia, known disparagingly as the *бывшие*, those who were considered 'former, ex-, one-time' (i.e. no longer relevant) in Soviet times.

птица-блядуница	и уж птица-блядуница ему на волосья нагадила, (R: 90)	the shitbird has already messed on his hair (E: 62)

In this compound noun we have the word *птица* for 'bird' juxtaposed with the word *блядь*, literally a 'prostitute or whore' (f) or 'bastard' (m), + the colloquial jocular suffix *ун* + the feminine suffix *ица*. When used on its own as an interjection, the word *блядь* is deemed the equivalent of the word 'fuck!' in English (OED). Therefore, the English translation of the compound 'shitbird' is adequate if arbitrary.

Слеповран	Может, это слеповран. (R: 62)	Maybe it's a blindlie bird (E: 42)

Слеповран - a type of bird, takes its name from the adjective *Слепой* 'blind' and the infinitive of the verb *врать* 'to lie' and is a semi-abbreviation, in that it is formed from a truncated adjective and a truncated neuter collective noun *вранье* – 'lies, lying'. Again, the English translation reflects this structure, using the adjective 'blind' and the noun 'lie'

to form ‘blindlie’ which can usefully be read in English as a compound noun, or with ‘lie’ interpreted as a diminutive noun form.

Хлебеды	муку из хлебеды, (R: 17)	wheatweed flour (E: 9)

Хлебеда appears to be formed from the initial noun *Хлеб* ‘bread’ and the second and third syllables of the word *лебеда-* ‘a swan’ . There appears to be confusion over whether to term this ‘goosefoot’ or ‘wheatweed’ in the translation.

Хлебеды	хлебеды, да по два мотка ниток некрашеных. (R: 68)	half a pood of goosefoot bread to the Golubchiks (E: 47)

Червыря	столько грязи процедишь, пока червыря нащупаешь, да он еще вьется, (R: 43)	sift through a lot of mud till you feel the worrum, and then it wiggles around (E: 29)

The word *Червь* + the suffix *ырь* combine to form a rather collective noun for ‘worms’. The distortion of the word is reflected in the English mis-spelling of ‘wurrums.’

Огнец	Спелый огнец величиной с человечий глаз будет. Ночью они светятся серебряным огнем, (R: 17)	A ripe fireling is the size of a person's eye (E: 10)

The word *огонь* ‘fire’ + the diminutive suffix *ец* forms огонец – ‘little fire’, here ably translated as ‘fireling’, using the equivalent English structure of noun + diminutive suffix.

Ржавки	ту на краску али на брагу больше применяют. Вот в сухой листик мелкой ржавки напехтаешь, самокруточку свернешь, в избу какую постучишь, огоньку у лю (R: 60)	You stuff fine rusht into a dry leaf, roll a smoke (E: 41)

The word *ржавь*, being the basic material for smoking, drinking and making ink, would appear to be a noun form from the infinitive *ржаветь* 'to rust'. The English equivalent 'rusht' similarly uses a distorted form of the noun 'rust'.

Кохинорец	потом опять вниз, мимо кохинорской слободы. Если кохинорец высунется, кинешь в него камнем для по (R: 58)	then down again past the Cockynork neighborhood (E: 39)
Кохинорцы	кохинорцы эти не по-нашему говорят. Бал-бал-бал да бал-бал-бал, - да и все ту (R: 58)	the Cockynorks, they don't talk like us (E: 39)
Кохинорцы	кохинорцы из мышиных хвостов торбочки плетут, туески, (R: 60)	The Cockynorks weave bags and baskets (E: 41)

In fact the 'Cockynork' settlement would appear to have its roots in the name for the all-pervasive pencils of the Soviet era:- the Koh-i-Noor pencil company[1], in Russian *Кох-и-норский* 'kokhinorskii'. The English translation reproduces the 'exotic' foreignness of the name, appropriate to a group of 'the Other' who live beyond the city limits, and even adds an 'Alice in Wonderland' sound to the word, with comic connotations.

Dissimilation of consonants is a prominent device in demotic speech and examples abound within the text:

Кажный	не кажный день каклеты парим. ".....", - (R: 241)	it's not every day we steam patties (E: 172)
Кажный	Не кажный. ".....", - читал Бенедикт (R: 241)	It sure isn't (E: 172)
Каклету	.. что думать-то надо?.. про каклету? остыло! (R: 250)	what should he think ... about the meat pattie (E: 179)
Каклеты	две каклеты - бакенбарды древнего фасону, , (R: 213)	two meat patties on the sides of his face (E: 151)
Калидоре	в калидоре, али сказать, в сенях расположился. конце, - на (R: 101)	The first guy to get there is in the hall, or mud room (E: 70)
канплимент	дверь открыть, канплимент теще, Оленьке канплимент, с ат (R: 303)	open the door, pay Mother-in-law or Olenka compliments (E:219)

[1] Founded 1790, moved to Czechoslovakia 1848. Currently privatised – KOH-I-NOOR HARDTMUTH.

Кажный (*каждый*) *Каклету* (*котлеты*) *Калидоре* (*корридоре*) *канплимент* (*комплимент*) have all suffered some distortion by consonants, with the latter three items appearing to undergo *аканье* where initial o is pronounced 'a'. Although the translator has indeed substituted 'hall' for 'corridor' this would appear to be a case of domestication and there is really no acknowledgement of the damaged language used in the Russian original.

Покрепше	ну, тут заговор нужен покрепше, чтоб держалося. (R: 38)	then you need a stronger spell so it'll last (E: 25)
Покрепше	Покрепше там примотайте чтоб не падало сами (R: 88)	Tie this stuff on tight so it doesn't fall of f on top of you (E: 61)
Покрепше	покрепше встать, расставя ноги, а руками-то размахнувши в стороны, да и то (R: 106)	plant your feet firm, spread your arms wide, and stomp! taking care not to fall (E: 74)
Покрепше	ругань у них покрепше нашей (R: 139)	they swear a sight better than we do (E: 97)
Покрепше	покрепше. (R: 364)	Tie him to that column or something, only make sure he's tied tight (E: 264)

In the above examples the consonant *ч* has been assimilated to the sibilant *ш*, a feature of demotic speech not reflected in the translation.

The application of hypercoristics, i.e. terms with an affectionate purpose, is one of the most widespread of the popular speech of everyday life. Use of these terms can be seen to awaken the impression of reality, almost allowing the reader to enjoy a conversation with the narrator:

Example:

> На семи холмах раскинулся городок Федор-Кузьмичск, родная сторонка, и шел Бенедикт, поскрипывая свежим снежком, радуясь февральскому солнышку, любуясь знакомыми улочками. (R:6)
>
> His hometown, Fyodor-Kuzmichsk, spread out over seven hills. Benedikt walked along listening to the squeak of fresh snow, enjoying the February sun, admiring the familiar streets. (E:2)

In the example above it is clear that this feature is not replicated, being translated with standard noun forms.

Горяченького	А Оленька чтоб оладьев поднесла да кваску горяченького. (R: 160)	And for Olenka to bring him pancakes and hot kvas (E: 112)
Грамотненько	все было промыслено грамотненько, тщательно. (R: 106)	everything was planned carefully, with real smarts (E: 73)

The suffix used in the two examples above is the most productive of the adjectival diminutive suffixes, adding a wide range of meaning from expressions of positive emotions (love, tenderness, sympathy, compassion) to those of negative value (hate, contempt, disparagement, disdain) (Bratus 1969:43). In the first translation there is no attempt to reflect this quality of the diminutive which can be compensated for using the analyticity of the English language to produce phrases such as 'some lovely hot kvass'.

In the second example the heightened expressive colouring of an increase in the adverbial quality (literally 'competently') is rendered in modern, colloquial American speech, perhaps well aimed at the target culture.

Звездюлей	щас мы вам вдогонку звездюлей-то накидаем. (R: 72)	Or else we'll beat the fish out of you (E: 50)
Звездюлей	Оленьке бы тоже звездюлей навесил: (R: 323)	Olenka would have got what was coming to her as well (E: 234)
Здоровьичко	рукавом морду обтереть, и - на здоровьичко, свободен (R: 111)	wipe your face with your sleeve and you're free at last (E: 77)
Здоровьичко	Читай на здоровьичко, у меня цельная библиотека старопечатных, (R: 227)	Why not? Read to your heart's content, I have a whole library (E: 162)

In the first two examples of noun diminutives (based on the standard noun *звезда*, 'star') above Tolstaya would appear to have created what Bratus refers to as 'author's diminutives', i.e. those which are typical of the individual style of a writer and which serve as a reserve for supplementing the expressive resources of the language. (Bratus

1969:35) The diminutive suffix is reminiscent of the sing-song *люли люлушеньки* refrain of a child's lullaby, thus lending added colour to the word.

In the third and fourth examples above Tolstaya uses a diminutive suffix of the second degree of expressiveness, albeit distorted from the expected *здоровьишко*, as applied to the exclamation *на здоровье*, 'your health!' Such diminutives convey disparagement or a condescending irony - 'your very good health' (ibid: 33-34). Gambrell's translation using the expression 'at last' doesn't really convey the ironic congratulation, perhaps intimating that the recipient 'won't be so lucky next time'. Benedikt's use of the adjective *цельная,* which means 'whole' in the sense of 'of a piece', rather than *целая,* meaning 'complete', adds to the humour and is not captured in the straightforward translation 'whole'.

According to Zemskaia (1983: 184), a characteristic sign of demotic speech is the use of forms of oblique case in the singular or plural of the pronouns *он она оно* with a preposition without prior 'n':

у его	у его на могиле вся земля осемши и провалимши, (R: 32)	Then the ground around his grave sank and caved in (E: 21)
у ей	- а есть ли у ей и вправду чувства какие? (R: 63)	but does she really have any feelings (E: 43)

It appears the translation chooses not to replicate this feature in the English, although the variants 'is and 'er are available within English demotic speech.

3.5.2. Analysis of Verbs

One of the most prominent features of the language of folk literature is the use of the present gerund in *–учи –ючи* and frequently the reflexive particle сь is added to non-reflexive verbs, and this is a feature frequently used by Tolstaya to give a folkloric colouring to the text:

Тащучи	глину месят, сани тащучи; из сил выбиваются, матюгаются, а сани ни с места (R: 128)	kneading the clay mud with their felt boots, hauling the sleighs (E: 90)
Видючи	не видючи, душа-то и обомрет: что это?! А ?! (R: 282)	who knows what you might find or touch, not seeing what it is (E: 203)

It is admittedly difficult to find a translation strategy to replicate this device in English, but one possibility, if the rest of the text was written with the same folkloric tenor, is to employ the English prefix , *a* with or without hyphen, to the verb, adding the nuance of 'in the process of (an activity)' (OED) – ie '*a-hauling*', '*a-seeing*'.

The Perfective Adverbial Participle

This construction emerged in its contemporary form, it is said, at a relatively late period in the Pskov-Novgorod dialectal element. Indeed Trubinskii (1984:156) cites evidence of some use of these participles in the birch-bark reading and writing as early as the 12th century which were very similar to phrases in the dialogic writings with the 'new perfect' It is therefore particularly characteristic for the dialects of the "slender-vowel" North West, ie the dialects of the Pskov, Novgorod, Leningrad in part Kaliningrad and in part Smolensk regions as well as the Russian dialects of Karelia and the Baltic republics.

These constructions are used throughout the novel and, as archaic forms, contribute much to the folk-poetic flavour of the text, but there is no obvious means of replicating them in translation:

Емши	Вот Бенедикт с утра, не пимши-не емши, только морду ополоснет, - и читать. (R: 234)	First thing in the morning, without eating or drinking, Benedikt splashed water on his face (E: 167)
Жрамши	Вот, нашутимшись, умаешься. Опосля так жрать охота, будто три года не жрамшикуды ты (R: 124)	Then you're starving, like you hadn't eaten for three years (E: 87)

Another feature noticeable here is that the Russian verbs 'to eat' and 'to devour' are translated by the former, thus depriving the translation of the richness of the latter.

It would be possible to devote considerably more time to examining the use of verb forms, and features of syntax, such as asyndeton, widely used in the novel and accessible through the corpus obtained, but this would be a larger work, outside the scope of the present work.

Appendix: Wordsmith Counts

The word-list feature of the Wordsmith software was used to examine and compare the lexical and syntactical structure of the original Russian version with the American English translation. As a marker, text versions of two Bibles, the King James AV in English and the Synod Text in Russian, were downloaded from the Internet and searched using Wordsmith. A summary of the results is as follows:

	English Bible	Russian Bible
Tokens used for word-list	851,866	753,287
Types (distinct words)	12,768	51,721
Type/token ratio	1.50	6.87
Standardised TTR	28.89	46.21
Standardised TTR std. dev.	72.76	56.42
Mean sentence length(words)	28.63	30.47
Std. Dev.	20.49	36.10

The total number of words (the tokens) found in the text was greater in English than Russian and this difference is underestimated as the Russian text contains additional material not in the English text. The number of definite/indefinite articles in the English text was 63,919/9,878 respectively which represents part of the variation.

The number of distinct words (the types) was about four times greater in Russian, and the resulting type/token ratio (TTR) was 1.50% in English compared to 6.87% in Russian. Part of this difference could be due to the way Wordsmith identifies distinct words in Russian compared to English.

Wordsmith produces a "standardised TTR" by dividing the text into blocks of 1,000 words and calculating the TTR separately for each block: the average of these is the standardised TTR and in this exercise the Russian figure was 46.21% compared to the English 28.89%. The "standardised TTR std. dev." gives an indication of how much the TTRs of each block vary from one another and the higher English figure implies that English text blocks contain a larger number of low TTRs compared to Russian.

The comparison of the standardised TTRs with the TTR for the full text implies that English is not only less lexically dense than Russian but that, as a text increases in size, the rate of introduction of new types into the English text dries up much faster than for Russian- hence the large difference between the TTRs for the entire text.

For the Bible, sentence lengths in both Russian and English are similarly large due to the nature of the work.

Introducing the Wordsmith results for Kys'/Slynx the summary is as follows:

	English		Russian	
	Bible	Slynx	Bible	Kys'
Tokens	851,866	97,660	753,287	70,966
Types	12,768	8,111	51,721	17,157
TTR	1.50	8.31	6.87	24.18
Standardised TTR	28.89	44.09	46.21	58.15
Std. Dev.	72.76	55.01	56.42	40.96
Mean sentence length	28.63	10.40	30.47	8.03
Std. Dev.	20.49	10.06	36.10	9.33

The English text contains nearly 40% more tokens but less than half the number of types as the Russian text, resulting in a TTR of 8.31% compared to 24.18%. (In the English text, the number of appearances of the definite/indefinite article is 4,864/2,788 respectively.) The standardised TTR figures for both texts are higher than the Bible comparison, the English text figure again being less than the Russian whilst exhibiting greater variation. Both texts show much shorter sentences than the Bible, but the result is consistent with the syntactical structure of the translation in general following that of the original.

The conclusion is that, although the translation exhibits a markedly less dense lexical variation amidst a greater number of words, such a difference is not inconsistent given the different structures of the two languages and the way the Wordsmith software calculates TTRs in the two languages.

Chapter 4: The Library Scene - 'An Encyclopaedia of Russian Life'[1]

In this chapter it is proposed to investigate how the translator handles a section of text that appears to require detailed knowledge of Russian history right up to the present time in order to grasp the undercurrent which flows below the surface – for the text in question, spread over five pages of the Russian novel, comprises fifteen separate lists of names and book titles. What superficially would appear to be an indulgence of the author, a piece of padding of no relevance to the progress of the story, in fact turns out to be an opportunity for Tolstaya to parade her wit whilst taking her readers on a guided tour through the literature of Russia from before the Soviet era, through the upheavals of the Revolution, the Stalinist purges, the Khruschev thaw, the repression and stagnation under Brezhnev right up to the collapse of the Soviet regime and the era of perestroika.

The lists in question are examples of Benedikt's ordering of his father-in-law's library, a collection of books that had survived the blast but which, to Benedikt's perception, were grouped together in an order that was totally illogical, making it nigh impossible to find the title one was looking for. Benedikt has sorted out the confusion, and now every book can quickly be located because of the natural ordering in which the books are now stored. Of course one drawback is that Benedikt has never learnt the alphabet…

After an introduction, this chapter analyses each list, initially without recourse to the translation, to ascertain the ordering system according to Russian language and culture. There then follows an analysis of how the translation 'Americanises' the library structure, with comments on what has been lost and gained through the process. It is apparent that one of the fifteen lists is of a quite different format to the others: a motive for this is suggested, and the implications of the approach of the translator to this particular list critically assessed.

[1] See Derek Offord on Belinskii's essays on Pushkin which contain the famous description of *Evgenii Onegin* as 'an encyclopaedia of Russian life' (Cornwell (ed.) 1998: 152).

4.1. Introduction

According to the critic Mark Lipovetsky, reprising Belinskii's famous description of Pushkin's 'Eugene Onegin' as 'an encyclopaedia of Russian life' , 'Tolstaya interlaces the alphabet with the encyclopaedia of Russian life, forcing them to look one another in the face […] – thus Benedikt arranges the books in his father-in-law's library on a ridiculous principle of association which is in essence no worse and no better than an alphabetic principle and which mirrors the ability of the former to take in the boundless diversity of all and everything' (Lipovetsky 2001: trans. LCK). In the library scene in particular we again witness Tolstaya's ability to use the device of *остранение* (ostranenie) in order to estrange that which is familiar to all of us, i.e. the convention of the order of the alphabet which does not exist in Benedikt's consciousness. Brian McHale describes this technique of postmodern writing as one where texts 'often strive to displace and rupture these automatic associations, parodying the encyclopedia and substituting for "encyclopaedic" knowledge their own *ad hoc*, arbitrary, unsanctioned associations', often with 'unsanctioned, skewed attribution' (McHale 1987: 48).

Lists or catalogues, according to McHale, are devices making regular appearances in postmodernist literature:

> As Gertrude Stein demonstrated, in order to detach the stratum of words from the stratum of the world, it is first necessary to disengage words from the syntax that controls the projection of worlds. Words disengaged from syntax – this could be a definition of the catalogue structure, a recurrent device of postmodernist style. From the ontological point of view, catalogues are paradoxical. On the one hand, they can appear to assert the full presence of a world, […] such catalogues seem to project a crowded world, one so inexhaustibly rich in objects that it defies our abilities to master it through syntax; the best we can do is to begin naming its many parts, without any hope of ever finishing. Yet at the same time, the decontextualization of words through the catalogue structure can have the opposite effect, that of evacuating language of presence, leaving only a shell behind – a word list, a mere exhibition of words […] catalogues in postmodernist fiction seem inevitably to gravitate toward the word-list pole, even if they begin as assemblages of objects. This mechanism can be observed in the hypertrophied list of titles and names (ibid: 153).

Further background for the inclusion of the library scene is provided by Tolstaya herself in a 1996 interview:

> 'In the literature of the 19th century, right up to the Revolution, it was pleasant to await the arrival of better times. This was connected with the fact that, firstly, things were happening which historically, as it were, propelled society somewhere forward: now the peasants were freed, now they received constitutionalism. Negative things were played down, regicide and all kinds of chaos associated with it, all that was banned from memory. And, clearly, things got better, and some kind of fledgling movement could be observed, if only there had been an awareness of this movement. But then everything was dashed, all classes, all types, all cultural convictions and institutions and all hopes. Literature, which in a way reflected the hope of the new post-revolutionary people, such as 'We will build our world, our new world' or 'Here we will have a garden city!' - literature was completely sincere and if I had lived then I might have understood these people. I don't know what would have been my personal reaction, whether I would have cried over broken dreams or whether I would have dreamt of a new order. But now, from our times, it is obvious that that was naïve and laughable. Furthermore, the joys of the proletariat never interested me. More dear to me always was that narrow, rich pre-revolutionary culture. That is for me the 'Golden Age' in some sense. I can well understand that there were horrors and disorder in that age, but that in no way cancels out any of the beauty which is in that literature. But everything after the revolution I simply do not like.' (Roll 1996: trans. LCK)

Therefore Tolstaya is approaching the construction of Benedikt's library system from a declared position of antipathy to 'everything' from the last 90 years. How she plans Benedikt's response to her stated position provides part of the sub-plot to the scene, one where the combination of Tolstaya's choice of contrasting materials combined with Benedikt's stupidity provides opportunities for comic absurdities. However Tolstaya's references are frequently obscure to a Western readership and much of this passage will mean little to anyone without a Russian background. In the following, the construction of Benedikt's library and Tolstaya's chosen authors and titles will be analysed to see whether the aim is just humour or whether a more substantial point is being made. With such a pattern of text, the translator's task could appear to be a thankless one: how Gambrell has gone about trying to make sense of this material for her American readership will also be considered. Page references in

this chapter will be abbreviated: the Russian original (Tolstaya, 2000) will be denoted by 'R' and the English translation (Tolstaya, 2003a) by 'E'.

Examples of Benedikt's library system are given in fifteen separate paragraphs in the original text (R: 246-250). The translation also features fifteen paragraphs (E: 176-179): two source text paragraphs (the second and the ninth) are combined and the resulting larger paragraph divided into two, the second and third paragraphs of the translation. In the following, titles of books are italicised and names of authors are in parentheses, while the notation 'paragraph (,)' refers to the paragraph numbers in the source text followed by the translation.

With the exception of paragraph (4,5), the entries are generally a combination of book titles and authors' names. There is evidence of some alphabetical ordering, although an author's name can intrude into the middle of a list of titles if it meets the alphabetical criterion and vice versa: in several cases Benedikt cannot tell whether the name of a person represents an author or title. In addition the alphabetical ordering does not consistently refer to the first word of the title or to the surname of the author, Benedikt apparently working by symbol recognition without understanding any alphabetical significance. Other sections are ordered differently; whilst the individual orderings may be easy to follow, establishing the link between differently ordered sections is not always straightforward: indeed it feels as if the author is setting a series of puzzles to test her readers' ingenuity and verbal dexterity.

One possible explanation for the ensuing chaos is that Benedikt inherited a library schema based on a higgledy-piggledy alphabetical ordering which made no sense to him. He therefore has put together books which he could see shared a connection, leaving the rest of the library in the order it was before, going by letter symbols. The only indication as to the previous ordering was that Gogol' and Chekhov had been next to each other (R: 245). The previous ordering can be seen as a comment of the state of the contemporary Russian library system.

Paragraph (4,5) consists solely of authors' names in various lists, each list sharing a common theme. The paragraph is of interest in that one assumes that Tolstaya wished to include certain authors and had to find simplistic links between their names

consistent with Benedikt's intellect. The choice of authors is examined at the end of this chapter along with the authors chosen by Gambrell to reproduce the style of the source text. It should be understood that the description 'author' is to be interpreted broadly throughout this chapter: many of the people listed will be far better known for some other reason than their ability to write, and indeed some have no legacy of any book likely to be found in a library under their authorship.

In the following, library entries in the tables are in the order they appear in the Russian source; the English equivalents alongside are as they appear in Gambrell's translation, whilst other English equivalents given in the main text are my own translations.

The primary source for information on Russian titles and authors is the *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*, edited by Neil Cornwell (1998). Descriptions of titles and authors, where not directly attributed, have been checked against internet sources, more than one where possible, including *Википедия* (http://ru.wikipedia.org), SovLit (www.sovlit.com) and *Люди* (www.peoples.ru) where applicable. In view of the large number of entries, and as the descriptions are only meant to provide brief reasons for inclusion in the library, thereby giving some overall feel for the nature of Tolstaya's construction, an extensive list of internet sources that would take up an enormous amount of space is not given separately: all references were re-checked on the internet in March 2007, but errors in internet entries may have been reproduced. Additional information is not given on authors who are widely known as it would be superfluous.

4.2 Benedikt's Library Schema

4.2.1. Part 1: Authors and Titles Listed Together

Paragraph (1,1)

Северный Вестник	*The Northern Herald*
Вестник Европы	*The Herald of Europe*
Русское Богатство	*Russian Wealth*
Урал	*The Urals*
Уральские Огни	*Lights of the Urals*
Пчеловодство (тут нет)	*Beekeeping* (no, not here)
Знамя	*Banner*
Новый мир	*New World*
Литературият Башкортостон	*Literary Bashkortostan*
'Тургенев'	'Turgenev'
'Якуб Колас'	'Yakub Kolas'
'Михалков'	'Mikhalkov'
'Петрарка'	'Petrarch'
	The Plague
	The Plague of Domestic Animals: Fleas and Ticks
'Попов'	'Popov'
другой 'Попов'	another 'Popov'
'Попцов'	'Poptsov'
'Попеску'	'Popescu'
Попка-дурак. Раскрась сам	*Popka-the-Fool—Paint It Yourself*
Илиада	*The Iliad*
Электрическая тяга	*Electric Current*
С ветром споря	*Gone With the Wind,*
Справочник партизана	*A Partisan's Handbook*
'Сартр'	'Sartre'
'Сартаков'	'Sartakov'
Сортировка бытового мусора	*Sorting Consumer Refuse*
'Софокл'	'Sophocles'
Совморфлоту -60 лет	*Sovmorflot-60 Years*
Гуманистические аспекты творчества Шолохова	*Sholokhov: Humanistic Aspects,*
Русско-японский политехнический словарь	*Russo-Japanese Poly-technical Dictionary*
	'Stockard'
	Manufacture of Stockings and Socks

The first paragraph (1,1) has twenty-nine Russian entries ('Попов' is included twice). After a collection of literary magazines from differing eras linking in to authors' names, the reader perceives a pattern emerging of items beginning with the letter *Поп* followed, after another link, by items beginning with the letter *С*.

The magazines are of various times: from *The Northern Herald*, a 19th century journal, up to *Banner* and *New World* of the 1980s. *Урал* (Ural) is both a literary magazine (famous for its celebrated experimental fiction edition[1], 1988 No.1) but at the same the name is provincial, the sort of place where honey is made – perhaps the reason for the beekeeping magazine that Benedikt removes, seeing no connection. To Benedikt's uneducated mind, the link from the last of the magazines to the first of the authors is evidently based on the ***тур*** syllable of the first word in *Литера**тур**ият Башкортостон, 'Literary Bashkortostan'* (Bashkir) being common to the first in the name of the writer '**Tur**genev'. The next link to 'Yakub Kolas' is obscure, although

[1] 'Incidentally, if you read over the best writing from [Ural 88: 1] you can be assured that it was good as an issue precisely for the creative insolence with which the men of letters set about the hopeless business of crowding out Nabokov and Huxley. Fantasy, by the way, also featured in the issue; clearly *Кысь*, according to some profound parameters, is akin to precisely this writing and not to the light re-makes of the present day, wherein it is asserted that they are the genuine, contemporary Russian novel' (Slavnikova 2001 trans. LCK).

possibly the **Tur**kic language **Yaku**t offers a link into **Yaku**b. Another unclear association follows: Sergei Mikhalkov[1] was chairman of the International Commonwealth of Writers' Unions, formed in 1992 after the break-up of the former Writers' Union. This organization was composed of writers' unions from the former Soviet Union republics (Shneidman 2004:6-8), which would include Belarus', the native country of Kolas[2] and may therefore offer a link with 'Mikhalkov'. *Патриарх Михаил* (Patriarch Michael)[3] provides a possible link between 'Mikhalkov' and 'Petrarch', from whence it is a short step to words beginning *Поп* (priest). The last of these, *Popka the Fool*, a painting book, may relate to *The Iliad* through the word *Иллюстрация* (illustration). The next links in Benedikt's thinking are from the *Или* of *Iliad* to the *Эле* of *Electrical*, from the double meaning of *тяга* (traction or draught of wind) to the *ветром* (literally 'with the wind') of *с ветром споря* ('betting for money'). Thereafter, following the pattern of words with common letters starting with ***с*** 's', from ***спо****р****я*** (betting) to the ***спр****а* of *Справочник* (handbook) to '**С**а**р**тр' ('Sartre'). The entry on the humanistic aspects of Sholokhov[4] may evoke reference to his novel *Тихий Дон* (Quiet Flows the Don) (1928-40), chronicling the events surrounding the Russian Civil War when the Don region lost half its population, as subsequently doubt was voiced over his authorship of the novel. The final link into the Russo-Japanese polytechnical dictionary may be a reference to the Russian-Japanese war of 1904-5; the surrender of the Russian army at the beginning of 1905

[1] Sergei Mikhalkov (1913-), author of children's books and satirical fables, writer of the lyrics of his country's national anthem on three different occasions.

[2] Yakub Kolas (1882-1956), Belarusian writer, awarded the USSR State Prize in 1946 and 1949.

[3] Patriarch Michael 1 (1000-1059) was instrumental in the split of the Orthodox Church from Roman Catholicism.

[4] Mikhail Sholokhov (1905-1984), Russian novelist and winner of the 1965 Nobel Prize for Literature. 'In 1925 Sholokhov was not yet 20 when he began the first two books of his epic novel, *Quiet Flows the Don* […] For their part in suppressing the rebellions of 1905 the Cossacks had been regarded as cruel barbarians by many Russians. Sholokhov sought to redress the balance […] Book 1 set out first the pre-war scenes in a Cossack village […] Since the first parts of the novel were published rumours have circulated that Sholokhov plagiarized the work of some other writer. Solzhenitsyn, Tomashevskaia, and other ingenious critics have exercised their talents in attempting to lend substance to these rumours […] Unless some solid evidence is produced to the contrary, Sholokov must be considered the true author' (Murphy, A. in Cornwell (ed.): 733).

was one of the factors that lead to the failed Revolution of that year, part of the background for Sholokhov's novel.

The result of this classification is that a wide range of authors of various genres and a list of works ranging from ancient classics to technical and reference books by way of a child's painting book are all grouped together in what Benedikt considers to be a perfectly logical ordering. The translation faithfully follows the Russian entries (with minor alterations to preserve alphabetical order) but includes four additional items. These are *The Plague* and *The Plague of Domestic Animals: Fleas and Ticks*, transferred from the second paragraph of the source text (as in translation they begin with *P*), likewise *Manufacture of Stockings and Socks* (listed under *S* in the translation), plus the addition of the author 'Stockard' (also under *S*). There is a glimpse of the translator's voice, as the translation given for *с ветром споря* ('betting for money') is *Gone with the Wind*, the title of the famous novel by the American author Margaret Mitchell (1900-1949), something which actually amounts to domestication through substitution of a title better known to the target audience. The problem for the translator is that many links do not translate – in fact some links in the Russian source have had to be broken to enable an alphabetical continuity which holds together sections of the target text. The Western reader will be familiar with some of the authors, but others will not be so well known[1]: the inclusion of the author 'Stockard' links into the transferred item ...*Stockings*... although the most well-known 'Stockard' in America is 'Stockard Channing'[2] .

---

[1]Evgenii Popov (1946-), prose writer , involved in the *Метрополь* (*Metropol'*) affair [in 1979 a group of writers attempted to publish an almanac entitled *Metropol'* without the permission of the Writers' Union], and was unable to publish in USSR 1979-86 (Cornwell (ed.): 659), "one of the best representatives of the 'lost' generation of writers associated with Brezhnev's Russia. Such writers were too young to have established a reputation either at home or internationally during the more liberal Khrushchev era that might have assured them some immunity in the 'stagnant' years that followed. Yet they continued to write…" (Porter, R., in Cornwell (ed.): 660).
Nikolai Popov (1938-), painter and illustrator, author of wordless children's book *Why?*
Oleg Poptsov (1934-), journalist, sacked as Chairman of Russian TV Channel 2 by Elts'in (Yeltsin) in 1996.
Dumitru Popescu (1935-), Romanian writer and former Communist politician, author of *The Royal Hunt*.
Sergei Sartakov (1908-2005), writer of Siberian novels, the trilogy *Barbin Cycle* winning the USSR State Prize in 1970.

[2] Stockard Channing (1944-), American actress with leading support role in the film *Grease* (1978, dir. Randal Kleiser)

Paragraphs (2,2) and (2,3)

The second source paragraph, (2,2) and (2,3), follows a pattern of entries starting with *Ч* followed by *Ка* then, after a link, *Пу* and finally *Л*. Between these latter two, there are three titles that include the word *убийство* (murder) and a link word into the entries starting with *Л*.

We can speculate that the jump from words starting with *Ч* to words starting with *Ка* may be due to something as whimsical as the shape of the letter *Ч*, referred to as 'like an upside-down chair' (R: 326) (E: 236), and ***Каф**едра* (a chair in the professorial sense) relating to '**Каф**ка' (Kafka the author). The link from the last of the titles starting with the syllable *Ка*, namely *Камское речное пароходство*, into *Що за птиця?* appears to be quite complex to a non-Russian. A favourite Russian saying linked to rivers is 'only an exceptional bird can reach the middle of the [river] Dnieper', written by Gogol' to give the impression of fantastic size. The expression *Що за птиця?* is mock-Ukranian and also links to Gogol'[1] through both *птиця* (relates to bird) and Ukraine . The link from *Що за птиця?* to 'Пу Сун-лин' may be nothing more than both titles appearing weird and foreign. Thereafter the order is alphabetical until after the last of

'Бенвенуто Челлини'	
Чешуекрылые Армении, выпуск пятый	*Chrysanthemums of Armenia Part V*
	Chalk Farm
	'Chaucer'
'Джон Чивер'	'John Cheever'
'Чиполлино'	
Черный принц (ага, вот и ошибся, эту не сюда)	*The Black Prince* (aha, a mistake, that didn't go there)
Чудо-дерево	
Чума	to paragraph (1,1)
Чумка у домашних животных	to paragraph (1,1)
	'Chekhov'
	'Chapchakhov'
	Chakhokhbili in Kar-sian
	Chukh-Chukh: For Little People
Чум - жилище народов Крайнего Севера	*Chum—Dwelling of the Peoples of the Far North*
'Чулков'	
Чулочно-носочное производство	to paragraph (1,1)
'Чулаки'	
Чукотка. Демографический обзор	*Chukotka: A Demographic Review*
'Чандрабхагнешап-хандра Лал, том восемнадцатый'	*Chandrabkhangneshap khandra Lal, vol. 18*
Чень-Чень.Озорные сказки народов Конго	*Chen-Chen: Tales of the Congo*
	Cherokee Customs
	Chewing Gum Stories
	Chingachguk the Giant Serpent
	Chipmunks and Other Friendly Rodents
	'Chkalov'
	'Chukovsky'
	Churchill …the Early Years
Кафка	'Kafka'
Каши из круп	*Kashas Derived from Whole Grain*
Как мужик гуся делил	
Карты звездного неба	
Камо грядеши?	
Камское речное пароходство	*Kama River Steamboats*
Що за птиця?	
'Пу Сун-лин'	
Пустыня Гоби	
Ракетам - пуск!	
	Dial M for Murder
Убийство в Месопотамии	*Murder in Mesopotamia*
Убийство в Восточном экспрессе	*Murder on the Orient Express*
Убийство Кирова	*Kirov`s Murder*

[1] See foot of next page

Урарту	
Ладушки	
	Laudanum: The Poetic Experience
	Lilliputians and Other Little People
‘Лимонов’	‘Limonov’
	‘Lipchitz’
Липидо-белковый обмен в тканях	*Lipid-protein Tissue Metabolism*

the *Пу* words *Ракетам - пуск!*, following which the link into the first of the ‘murder’ entries, *Убийство в Месопотамии*, could relate to the syllable *там* (tam). Two further links are puzzling: from *Убийство Кирова* to *Урарту* to *Ладушки*. It can be noted that, in this paragraph alone of all the paragraphs in this section of source text, some entries are divided by semi-colons, some by commas and, in the case of the titles either side of *Урарту*, by ellipses. It could be that the use of the ellipsis indicates the omission of items and hence no obvious link: connecting the murder of Kirov and its associations with barbaric behaviour to *Урарту* (Urartu or the Kingdom of Ararat) seems unlikely unless the link is alphabetical; Urartu was one of the ancient civilisations taught to young children in Soviet times, hence a tenuous link to *Ладушки* (Ladushki, a lullaby). Thereafter the ordering is alphabetical. The details of the connection with Gogol’ are given below[1].

This system of ordering is for the most part followed by the translation: the entries in (2,2) start with *Ch* but some of them are lifted from the later source paragraph (9,-), consisting of four entries reflecting the sound *Ч* followed by *x* (‘Chekhov’, ‘Chapchakhov’, *Chakhokhbili in Karsian* and *Chukh-Chukh: For Little People*). The inclusion of these items temporarily loses the alphabetical ordering of the translation, and the translator ends paragraph (2,2) at this point. In the subsequent (2,3), the alphabetical ordering is recovered. (The item *Черный принц* in (2,1) could be seen as being in its correct alphabetical place in the source text but is ‘misplaced’ because another classification takes precedence: the English equivalent *The Black Prince* does not belong among the *Ch* entries.)

[1] Nikolai Vasil’evich Gogol’ (1809-1852) was born in Poltava, Ukraine. ‘His real surname was Ianovskii, but in an attempt to claim more noble Cossack ancestry, the writer’s grandfather had tacked on the name Gogol’ (which means “golden eye duck”). Gogol’ himself had a long and “beaky” nose, and […] noses, overweening pretensions, comic names, the motif of birds, the Ukraine – all these would figure prominently in his later writing’ (Peace, R. in Cornwell (ed): 331).

The Russian entries that have been omitted from the translation consist of 'Benvenuto Cellini' and 'Cipollino' (which do not start with *Ch* in English), *Чудо-дерево* (The Magic Tree), 'Chulkov', 'Chulaki', *Как мужик гуся делил* (How the Peasant Divides up a Goose), *Карты звездного неба*, (Charts of the Starry Sky), *Камо грядеши?* (Quo Vadis), all three entries starting with *Пу* and the preceding link word, namely *Що за птиця?* (written in mock-Ukrainian), 'Pu Sun-lin', *Пустыня Гоби* (Gobi Desert), *Ракетам - пуск!* (Missiles – fire!), the link word before the entries starting with *Л, Урарту* (Urartu) and the subsequent *Ладушки* (Ladushki). Words beginning with 'Ch' introduced by the translator are *Chalk Farm*, 'Chaucer', *Cherokee Customs*, *Chewing Gum Stories, Chingachguk the Giant Serpent*, *Chipmunks and Other Friendly Rodents,* 'Chkalov', 'Chukovsky' (seemingly as substitutes for 'Chulkov' and 'Chulaki') and *Churchill ...the Early Years*. An additional item with 'murder' in the title is *Dial M for Murder*, and the translator has substituted as a link between 'murder' and the letter *L* the entry *Laudanum: the Poetic Experience* as well as introducing *Lilliputians and Other Little People* and 'Lipchitz'. One title which appears to have been normalised in translation is *Chen-Chen: Tales of the Congo* which omits the colloquial adjective *озорные* (mischievous or naughty) from the full title 'Mischievous Tales of the Peoples of the Congo'.

Of the three Russian authors who could be unfamiliar to her readership[1], Gambrell has omitted two and, rather curiously, elected to replace them with two different Russian authors[2], one of whom appears in the source text of paragraph (4,5) but not

[1] Georgii Chulkov (1879-1939), symbolist poet and writer, created manifesto of 'creative anarchism'.
Mikhail Chulaki (1941-), writer, Chairman of the Human Rights Commission for St. Petersburg.
Eduard Limonov (1943-), prose writer, poet and essayist, lived abroad 1974-91, majority of novels published in Paris, formed his own National Radical Party, November 1992 (Cornwell (ed.): 506-7). "Critical opinions of Limonov are varied, ranging from outrage through to sympathy and admiration…the publication of previously censored alternative prose writers and the now widespread availability of pornography in Russia has considerably reduced the shock value of his work" (Tilly, H.L. in Cornwell (ed.): 508)

[2] Kornei Chukovskii (1882-1969), critic, memoirist, literary translator and children's writer, born Nikolai Korneichuk, recipient of Lenin prize (Cornwell (ed.): 232). See footnotes to paragraph (4,5) in section 4.2.2.1.
Valerii Chkalov (1904-38), test pilot, hero of the Soviet Union 1938.

the target text, whilst the other is a military hero: neither is well-known to western readers.

The source text items of this paragraph cover a deal of ground linked together by a rationale that can be difficult to pick out. The translation mainly follows alphabetical ordering, and in one case an original link has been introduced to the benefit of the continuity of the target text.

Paragraph (3,4)

Красное и черное	*The Red and the Black*
	Baa Baa Black Sheep
Голубое и зеленое	*The Blue and the Green*
	The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle
Голубая чашка	*The Blue Cup*
	Island of the Blue Dolphins
	The Chocolate Prince
Аленький цветочек	*The Crimson Flower*
	The Crimson Letter
Алые паруса	*Crimson Sails*
	Little Red Riding Hood
Желтая стрела	*The Yellow Arrow*
Оранжевое горлышко	
	The Five Orange Pips
Дон Хиль - зеленые штаны	
Белый пароход	*The White Steamboat*
Белые одежды	*White Clothes*
Белый Бим - Черное ухо	*White Bim—Black Ear*
'Андрей Белый'	
	'T. H. White'
Женщина в белом	*The Woman in White*
Багровый остров	*The Purple Island*
Черная башня	*The Black Tower*
Черноморское пароходство. Расписание	*Black Sea Steamboats: Registry*
'Саша Черный'	
сюда *Черный принц*	this is where *The Black Prince* goes

The third paragraph of Benedikt's catalogue (3,4) deals with items which have 'colour' as their common theme and there is evidence that this classification has some priority as Benedikt duly transfers *The Black Prince* to this section – thus revealing something of his thought processes. Titles omitted by the translator from the sixteen original items in the Russian source text are: *Оранжевое горлышко* (The Orange Bottle), *Дон Хиль - зеленые штаны* (Don Gil and the Green Trousers) and the authors 'Andrei Belyi' and 'Sasha Chernyi' (i.e. Andrei White and Sasha Black). The translator has introduced the following items: *Baa Baa Black Sheep, The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle*, *Island of the Blue Dolphins*, *The Chocolate Prince*, *The Crimson Letter*, *Little Red Riding Hood*, *The Five Orange Pips* and the author 'T.H. White'.

This paragraph is straightforward for the translator and Gambrell has extended it by introducing the seven new titles. The two authors in the source text, little known to

Western readers[1], have been omitted as they would not fit in the translation. One author, well-known to American readers[2], whose name meets the schema of the translation, has been used as a substitute.

Paragraph (4,5)

The next paragraph (4,5) introduces an extensive list of authors which is analysed separately in section 4.2.2.

Paragraph (5,6)

The following paragraph (5,6) contains entries which feature several key words including *объятиях* (embrace), *отравленный* (poisoned) and *смерть* (death). No authors are present in this classification. The links between: *The All-Consuming Flame of Passion* and *The Dagger's Blow* may relate to popular films of the time, such as the popular *Bollywood* genre, while *Golden-haired Poisoners* and *Death Comes at Midnight* can be seen as making reference to the Russian folkloric figure of *полуночница* (polunochnitsa), a typical midnight demon among Russians who torments children at night (Oinas 1984:107).

В объятиях вампира	*The Vampire's Embrace*
В объятиях дракона	*The Dragon's Embrace*
В объятиях чужестранца	*The Foreigner's Embrace*
В гибельных объятиях	*The Fatal Embrace*
В объятиях страсти	*Passion's Embrace*
Огненные объятия	*Fiery Embraces*
Всепожирающее пламя страсти	*The All-Consuming Flame of Passion*
Удар кинжала	*The Dagger's Blow*
Отравленный кинжал	*The Poisoned Dagger*
Отравленная шляпка	*The Poisoned Hat*
Отравленная одежда	*Poisoned Clothes*
Кинжалом и ядом	*With Dagger and Poison*
Ядовитые грибы средней полосы России	*Poisonous Mushrooms of Central Russia*
Златокудрые отравительницы	*Golden-haired Poisoners*
	Arsenic and Old Lace
	Death of a Salesman
	Death Comes for the Archbishop
Смерть приходит в полночь	*Death Comes at Midnight*
Смерть приходит на рассвете	*Death Comes at Dawn*
Кровавый рассвет	*The Bloody Dawn*

[1]Andrei Belyi (1880-1934), poet and prose writer, outstanding and prolific member of the Russian symbolist movement, published and republished only sparingly throughout the Soviet period (Cornwell (ed.): 155).
Sasha Chernyi (1880-1932), poet and satirist, noted for children's poetry.

[2]Theodore H. White (1915-86), American journalist, best known for his accounts of presidential elections,
or alternatively (maybe less well known to American readers)
Thomas Hanbury White (1906-64), English novelist, best known for *The Once and Future King* (1958), a retelling of *Le Morte d'Arthur* by Thomas Malory (1405-71).

All seventeen original entries are translated and three items are introduced by the translator: *Arsenic and Old Lace, Death of a Salesman* and *Death Comes for the Archbishop.*

Paragraph (6,7)

Дети Арбата	*Children of the Arbat*
Дети Ванюшина	*Vanya's Children*
Дети подземелья	*Children of the Underground*
Дети Советской Страны	*Children of the Soviet Land*
Детки в клетке	*Kids in Cages*
Детям о Христе	*Children on Christ*
	The Boxcar Children
	Nikita's Childhood

The next paragraph (6,7) has as its theme *Дети* (children) and consists of six book titles, augmented in the translation with *The Boxcar Children* and *Nikita's Childhood*. Some inconsistency can be distinguished in that the original Russian gives *Детям о Христе* (About Christ for Children) as its title and this is changed in the English version to *Children on Christ* which suggests the children are giving their views on Jesus.

Paragraph (7,8)

'Маринина'	'Marinina'
Маринады и соления	*Marinating and Pickling*
Художники-маринисты	*Marine Artists*
Маринетти - идеолог фашизма	*Marinetti -the Ideologist of Fascism*
Инструментальный падеж в марийском языке	*Mari-El Grammar… Uses of the Instrumental Case*

In the next paragraph (7,8) all items in the English and Russian versions have the pattern *Мари* (Mari) at the beginning. Both versions are more or less identical with the exception of the final item where the translation dubiously (and for no obvious reason) uses the term *Mari-El Grammar* instead of 'Mari language': Mari is the language spoken in the Mari El Republic, a federal subject of Russia.

One author, 'Marinina'[1], appears in this paragraph. It would appear that the inclusion of this somewhat obscure classification in Benedikt's library catalogue has been arranged by Tolstaya to literally put Marinina in her place.

[1] Alexandra Marinina (1957-), best-selling writer of detective stories.

Paragraph (8,9)

'Клим Ворошилов'	'Klim Voroshilov'
Клим Самгин	'Klim Samgin'
'Иван Клима'	'Ivan Klima'
Климакс. Что я должна знать?	
'К.Ли'	'K. Li'
Максимальная нагрузка в бетоностроении: расчеты и таблицы. На правах диссертации	*Maxima Load in Concrete Construction: Calculations and Tables* (dissertation).

The following paragraph (8,9) uses the letters *Клим* (Klim) at the beginning of each item (the final item rolling over from the previous one) and is mirrored closely in translation, although the item *Климакс. Что я должна знать?* (Menopause. What should I know?) is omitted as clearly it no longer fits. The title *Клим Самгин*[1] (Klim Samgin) is translated as an author.

The humour of the paragraph lies in the contrast between the three names placed together in the listing[2], and also the other subject matter, including the roll-over referred to above (whereas there are many works by a 'K.Li', most are technical and none are familiar to a non-specialist audience – the 'author' has been invented for the purpose of this classification).

Paragraph (9,-)

'Чехов'	to paragraph (2,2)
'Чапчахов'	to paragraph (2,2)
Чахохбили по-карски	to paragraph (2,2)
Чух-чух. Самым маленьким	to paragraph (2,2)

The next paragraph (9,-), made up of four entries reflecting the sound *Ч* followed by *x*, has, as previously noted, been transferred in the translation to the second English paragraph (2,2). Whilst 'Chekhov' is universally famous, the other author[3] will not be familiar to the majority of western readers, nor will many understand that *чахохбили* (chakhokhbili) is a Georgian pork dish and *чух-чух* (chukh-chukh) is the sound made in children's stories by a vehicle or steam train[4].

[1] Maksim Gor'kii's final, unfinished novel is *Жизнь Клима Самгина* (*The Life of Klim Samgin*), a four-volume novel of Russian social conditions from 1880 to 1917.

[2] Kliment (Klim) Voroshilov (1881-1969), Soviet military commander, heavily involved in Stalin's great purge.
Ivan Klima (1931-), Czech novelist and playwright.

[3] The best-known Chapchakhov in Russia is not a writer but an ace fighter pilot, Lazar Chapchakhov (1911-42), winner of two Orders of Lenin and a Hero of the Soviet Union.

[4] The film about the car *Chitty Chitty Bang Bang* is called *Чух чух бум бум* in Russia.

Paragraph (10,10)

'Анаис Нин'	'Anaïs Nin'
'Нина Садур'	'Nina Sadur'
Ниневия. Археологический сборник	*Nineveh: An Archaeological Collection*
Ниндзя в кровавом плаще	*Ninja in a Bloody Coat*
	Mutant Ninja Turtles Return
Папанин. Делать жизнь с кого	*Papanin, Make Life from Whom?*

The next paragraph (10,10) features the letter grouping *Нин* (Nin). The translator has used the five entries in the original and introduced the further item *Mutant Ninja Turtles Return*. 'Anaïs Nin' is well-known as a diarist and writer of female erotica. The other Russians[1] will be less familiar to western readers, although 'Nina Sadur' is a contemporary of Tolstaya's and the opportunity to place her between 'Anaïs Nin' and archaeology could be the underlying purpose of this classification.

Paragraph (11,11)

Евгения Грандэ	'Eugenia Grandet'
Евгений Онегин	*Eugene Onegin*
'Евгений Примаков'	'Eugene Primakov'
'Евген Гуцало'	'Eugene Gutsalo'
Евгеника - орудие расистов	*Eugenics: A Racist's Weapon*
	'Eugene Sue'

The next paragraph (11,11) utilises the letter grouping *Евген* (Evgen) and all five items from the Russian version are included in the translation with an extra item, the French author 'Eugene Sue' being introduced in the target text and the translation rendering the title *Евгения Грандэ* as an author. Gambrell has legitimately domesticated the target text by changing 'Evgen' to 'Eugen' in order to match up the entries with the widely known *Eugene Onegin*: Pushkin's masterpiece finds itself grouped on the same shelf as three authors[2] of diverse background.

[1] Nina Sadur (1950-), author and playwright, one of the leading Russian female writers of her generation.
Ivan Papanin (1887-1964), polar explorer and, in wartime, overseer of all commercial operations on the Northern Sea Route; twice a Hero of the Soviet Union. His 1938 diaries *Жизнь на льдине* were translated into English under the title *Life on an Icefloe*.

[2] *Eugénie Grandet*, published in 1833, the first of the second series of novels in Balzac's *La Comédie Humaine*. Tolstaya has written elsewhere 'I was forced to read Balzac's *Eugénie Grandet* in French, and I will not be reading that book again even at gunpoint, although I enjoyed reading the "Russian" Balzac' (Tolstaya 2003c: 248).
Evgenii Primakov (1929-), contemporary politician, former Prime Minister of Russia.
Evgen Gutsalo (1937-95), Ukranian writer prominent in 1960s for writing in Ukrainian during period of general Russian domination.

Paragraph (12,12)

Гамлет — Принц Датский	*Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*
Ташкент — город хлебный	*Tashkent- City of Bread*
Хлеб — имя существительное	*Bread -A Common Noun*
Уренгой — земля юности	*Urengoi- The Land of Youth*
Козодой — птица вешняя	
Уругвай — древняя страна	*Uruguay-An Ancient Land*
Кустанай — край степной	*Kustanai - The Steppe Country*
Чесотка — болезнь грязных рук	*Scabies* -An *Illness of Dirty Hands*

In the next paragraph (12,12), eight titles are classified according to the formula 'proper noun – noun and adjective.' Anecdotal evidence is that these banal expressions were known to all schoolchildren in Soviet times.

In the translation, seven of the items are included, with *Козодой — птица вешняя* (Nightjar – Vernal Bird) being omitted.

Paragraph (13,13)

Гигиена ног в походе	*Foot Hygiene on the Road*
Ногин. Пламенные революционеры	'F. Leghold', *Ardent Revolutionaries*
	The Barefoot Doctors
	Flat Feet in Young Children
Ноготки. Новые сорта	*Claws: New Types*
Гуталиноварение	*Shoe Polish Manufacture*
Подрастай, дружок. Что надо знать юноше о поллюциях	*Grow Up, Friend: What a Young Man Needs to Know about Wet Dreams*
Руку, товарищ!	*Hands Comrade!*
Пошив брюк	*Sewing Trousers*
Старина четвероног	*The Time of the Quadrupeds*
Шире шаг!	*Step Faster!*
Как сороконожка кашку варила	*How the Millipede Made Porridge*
Квашение овощей в домашних условиях	*Marinating Vegetables at Home*
'Фолкнер'	'Faulkner'
Федорино горе	*Fyodor's Woe*
Фиджи: классовая борьба	*Fiji: Class Struggle*
Шах-намэ	'Shakh-Reza-Pahlevi'
'Шекспир'	'Shakespeare'
'Шукшин'	'Shukshin'

In the next paragraph (13,13) various criteria for classification are introduced. There are seventeen original entries, fourteen titles and three authors, and all are translated into English, although in one title an author is introduced and another title becomes an author in translation. The translation also introduces two titles, one being moved from a later paragraph.

The source classification starts with three items linked to ***ног*** (nog, from *нога* foot), although two have nothing to do with feet: *Ногин. Пламенные революционеры* (Nogin[1]. Ardent Revolutionaries) and *Ноготки. Новые сорта* (Marigolds. New classes). The syllable ***Нов*** (Nov) from ***Нов****ые* (new) also features in the middle of the combined word *Гуталиноварение* = *Гуталин* (shoe polish) + *о* + *варение*

[1] Viktor Nogin (1878-1924), a Bolshevik leader at the time of the Revolution.

(making). The next entry features three similar syllables, над as in *надо* (it is necessary), нать (nat') and нош (nosh), and is linked to the following through the exhortations to *friend* and *comrade*. There is a similarity in the voiced and unvoiced middle 'u' vowels in *руку* ('hand') and *брюк* ('trousers'). Thereafter the continuity relates to 'legs' until the similar sounding *кашку* (porridge) and *Квашение* (marinating). The pursuit of marinating vegetables might be considered part of folklore – *Фольклор* - hence a link to'Фолкнер' or 'Faulkner' and the next group of alphabetical links. This concludes with a link from *Фиджи* to *шах*, two strange-sounding oriental words, ending with two further entries starting with *Ш*. The unlikely classification has taken a tour from feet to legs via a diversion, before ending up with Shakespeare and a later playwright (see below).

The translator has elected to maintain the theme linking the initial Russian entries, namely feet, to connect the first six entries in her translation, and to this cause has introduced two entries: *The Barefoot Doctors* and *Flat Feet in Young Children*, the latter being transferred from the last paragraph (15,15) where the English translations begin with the letters *Pl* and this entry is no longer appropriate. Two other changes have been necessitated to support this classification: firstly the word *Ногин* in the title *Ногин. Пламенные революционеры* (Nogin. Ardent Revolutionaries) is changed into the name of the author 'F. Leghold'- an apparent invention of the translator to preserve the continuity of references to feet. Secondly the book entitled *Ноготки. Новые сорта* (Marigolds. New classes) is rendered as *Claws: New Types*, again to retain the reference to feet. The remainder of the paragraph is translated literally until the title *Шах-намэ*[1] becomes the author 'Shakh-Reza-Pahlevi'[2]. The first two of the three authors in the source text will be well known to American readers, the third less so[3]. Despite the best endeavours of the translator, much of the construction of this paragraph will remain a mystery to the reader.

[1] *Shahnama*, national poetic epic of the Persian-speaking world, written around 1000 AD.

[2] Mohammad Reza Pahlavi (1919-80), the last Shah of Iran, deposed in 1979.

[3] Vasilii Shukshin (1929-1974), prose writer, film director and actor, screenwriter, awarded USSR State Prize in 1971 and Lenin Prize in 1976 (posthumously) (Cornwell (ed.): 1998, 734)

Paragraph (14,14)

The next paragraph (14,14) is classified according to the occurrence of repeated onomatopoeic syllables. The seventeen items in the original are carried over to the translation and four introductions are made: the author 'Kokoschka'[1], *Popocatopetl*, *Raising Chihuahuas* and *The Adventures of Tin Tin*. Some of the authors[2] in the source text will not be familiar to many western readers, although it would appear that a reason for including this classification is to introduce 'Bibigon' amongst a list of writers (see footnote below).

Муму	*Mumu*
Нана	*Nana*
Шу-Шу. Рассказы о Ленине	*Shu-shu: Tales of Lenin*
Гагарин. Мы помним Юру	*Gagarin: We Remember Yura*
Татарский женский костюм	*Tartar Women's Costumes*
Бубулина - народная героиня Греции	*Bubulina-A Popular Greek Heroine*
'Боборыкин'	'Boborykin'
'Бабаевский'	'Babaevsky'
'Чичибабин'	'Chichibabin'
'Бибигон'	'Bibigon'
'Гоголь'	'Gogol'
Дадаисты. Каталог выставки	*Dadaists Exhibition Catalogue*
	'Kokoschka'
Мимикрия у рыб	*Mimicry in Fish*
Вивисекция	*Vivisection*
'Тютюнник'	'Tiutiunnik'
'Чавчавадзе'	'Chavchavadze'
Озеро Титикака	*Lake Titicaca*
	Popocatepetl
	Raising Chihuahuas
	The Adventures of Tin Tin

[1] Oscar Kokoschka (1886-1980), Austrian expressionistic artist.

[2] Petr Boborykin (1836-1921), writer, populariser of the term 'intelligentsia'.

Semyon Babaevskii (1909-2000), popular writer of the Stalinist period, winner of the USSR State Prize in 1949, 1950 and 1951.

Aleksei Chichibabin (1871-1945), chemist, winner of Lenin Prize in 1926, author of one of the main university-level chemistry textbooks of the USSR.

Bibigon, a leading Russian advertising agency.

Grigorii Tiutiunnik (1931-1980), Ukrainian writer of short stories

Ilia Chavchavadze (1837-1907), Georgian writer and one of the founding fathers of modern Georgia, canonized as Saint Ilia the Righteous by the Georgian Orthodox Church.

Paragraph (15,15)

'Платон'	'Plato'
'Плотин'	'Plotinus'
'Платонов'	'Platonov'
Плетення жинкових жакетов	*Plaiting and Knitting Jackets*
'Плисецкий Герман'	'Herman Plisetsky'
'Плисецкая Майя'	'Maya Plisetskaya'
Плиссировка и гоффрэ	
Плевна. Путеводитель	*Plevna: A Guide*
Пляски смерти	*Playing with Death*
Плачи и запевки южных славян	*Plaints and Songs of the Southern Slavs*
Плейбой	*Playboy*
Плитка керамическая. Руководство по укладке	*Plinths: A Guidebook*
Планетарное мышление	*Planetary Thinking*
Плавание в арктических водах	*Plying the Arctic Waters*
План народного развития на пятую пятилетку	*Plan for Popular Development in the Fifth Five-year Plan*
Плебеи Древнего Рима	*Plebeians of Ancient Rome*
Плоскостопие у детей раннего возраста	to paragraph (13,13)
	The Horn of Plenty in Oil Painting
Плевриты	*Pleurisy*
Плюшка, Хряпа и их веселые друзья	*Pliushka, Khriapa, and Their Merry Friends*
	Plenary Sessions of the CPSU
	The Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock

In the final paragraph (15,15) items are classified according to the occurrence of the syllable *Пл* and this is followed by the translation where entries start *Pl*. Five authors are in this list, two ancient classical Greek and three recent Russian[1]. Two items from the Russian original appear to have been combined in the translation – *Плетення жинкових жакетов* (The Weaving of Women's Jackets) and *Плиссировка и гоффрэ* (Braiding and Crimping) are rendered as one item *Plaiting and Knitting Jackets* ('plait' is defined as 'a braid in which strands are passed over one another in turn' from the Latin 'plicare' to fold, with 'pleat' being a derivative). In order to maintain the *pl* connection, a word of cultural significance *Пляски* in *Пляски смерти* has had to be translated as *playing* in *Playing with Death*, when in fact the reference is specifically to 'folk-dances' associated with the Russian rituals of Death. The book entitled *Плитка керамическая. Руководство по укладке* (Ceramic Tiles. Guidelines for packing) is rendered as *Plinths: a Guidebook* in order to retain the *pl* pattern. Three additions by the translator are *The Horn of Plenty in Oil Painting*, *Plenary Sessions of the CPSU* and *The Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock*.

[1] Andrei Platonov (1899-1951), prose writer who left large quantities of his literary output unpublished on his death. (Cornwell (ed.): 648)

Herman Plisetskii (1931-1992), poet and translator of Omar Khayyam into Russian.

Maya Plisetskaia (1925-), ballet dancer, acknowledged as one of the greatest ballerinas of modern times.

4.2.2. Part 2: The Authors Section

4.2.2.1. The Groupings of Russian Authors

The fourth paragraph of the Russian source consists of eleven lists of authors separated by ellipses. Each list shares a feature somewhere within the name of the authors that leads Benedikt to group them together. In this section the lists are analysed to show the source of the groupings and to give details of the authors who find themselves alongside each other under Benedikt's arrangement. Following this, in section 4.2.2.3 the approach taken by Gambrell's translation will be considered to assess which of the features of the original have been preserved.

i) Names featuring bread: there are three authors, 'Хлебников' (*хлеб*, bread), 'Караваева' (*каравай*, round loaf) and 'Коркия' (*корка*, crust).

> Velimir Khlebnikov (1885-1922), poet and prose writer associated with the Futurist and other literary groups. "His main contribution to the Futurist aesthetic was in the area of language. One of his earliest published works was the notorious poem *Zaklinanie smekhom* (Incantation by Laughter) which consists entirely of a string of invented words derived from the root *sme-* (laugh). He invented elaborate theories about the semantic values of word-roots and of individual phonetic elements and used the *zaum'* or 'transrational language" thus created as the medium for his work. On occasion this takes the form of pure sound painting, but more often *zaum'* is combined with normally referential language in which sound play, neologisms, puns and complex strings of metaphorical and etymological associations create an evocative discourse that appeals as much to the senses as to reason… his work is in many ways the archetype of the Russian avant-garde." (Wells, D. N. in Cornwell (Ed): 439)

> Anna Karavaeva (1893-1979), prose writer and chief editor on literary journal *Molodaya Gvardiya*, overseeing publication of Nikolai Ostrovskii's *How the Steel was Tempered*. During World War 2 served as correspondent for *Pravda*, publishing patriotic sketches *Stalin's Masters: Tales of People and Days* (1943).

Awarded Stalin Prize in 1951 for trilogy 'Motherland' featuring the heroic labour and struggles of those in the rear during the war. Awarded Order of Lenin five times. (Terras: 173)

Viktor Korkiia (1948-), playwright born in Moscow of Georgian descent. Was poetry editor at *Yunost'* magazine and one of the creators of the new wave in poetry in the 1970's. First major play *The Mystery Man, or, I am Poor Soso Dzhugashvili*, a philosophical farce in verse about Joseph Stalin and Lavrenty Beria, enjoyed great success on being staged at Moscow University in 1988. (Freedman, J. in Moscow Times, 13/9/2001).

ii) **Names featuring food and one's relation to food**: again there are three authors, 'Колбасьев' (*колбаса*, sausage), Сытин (*сытый*, full-up) and Голодный (*голодный*, hungry).

Sergei Kolbas'ev (1889-1937), Russian writer and mariner whose autobiographical writing stemmed from experience of service in Red Fleet. Anthologies of verse include *Открытое море* (The Open Sea, 1922) and collections of stories include *Правила совместного плавания* (Rules for Sailing as a Team, 1935). Denounced in 1937, died in captivity, posthumously rehabilitated.

Ivan Sytin (1851-1934), Moscow publisher and bookseller who produced about a quarter of all Russia's book production at the beginning of the First World War, distinguished by high level of typography and modest cost. After the 1917 Revolution, Sytin received assurances from Lenin that he could publish for the Bolshevik regime, only to be cast off as a capitalist after Lenin died in 1924.

Mikhail Golodnyi (1903-1949), poet and author of popular Soviet songs.

iii) **Names featuring unbalanced or crooked physical characteristics:** one of the three authors is well-known outside Russia, 'Набоков' (*на* + *бок*, 'to the side'), 'Косолапов' (*косой*, bent/sloping) and 'Кривулин' (*кривой*, crooked).

Vladimir Nabokov (1899-1977), prose writer, translator and lepidopterist. Born in St Petersburg, his family emigrated in 1916; studied Romance and Slavonic Languages at Cambridge University, England. Moved to Berlin 1922-37. Sailed to United States 1940. Thereafter wrote in English. Professor of Russian Literature, Cornell University 1948-59. Retired after success of 'Lolita'. Began to be published in Russia only in 1986. (Cornwell: 559)

Alexander Kosolapov (1943-), proponent of Sotsart (Russian pop art). Has lived and worked in New York city since 1975.

Viktor Krivulin (1944-2001), poet and editor of. *37*, the first *samizdat* journal devoted to literature, art, religious and cultural commentary, also co-edited 'Northern Post' (1979-80). In them he wrote about the works of poets and novelists including Innokentii Annenskii, Andrei Belyi, Osip Mandelshtam and Josef Brodsky – themselves unpopular with the regime. Vice-president of St Petersburg PEN club. (Cornwell: 467)

iv) Names featuring insects: the six authors are 'Мухина' (*муха*, fly), 'Шершеневич' (*шершень*, hornet), 'Жуков' (*жук*, beetle), 'Шмелев' (*шмель*, bumble bee) 'Тараканова' (*таракан*, cockroach) and 'Бабочкин' (*бабочка*, butterfly).

a) Vera Mukhina (1889-1953), artist and sculptor whose most celebrated work was the giant monument 'The Worker and Kolkhoz Woman', the centrepiece of the Soviet pavilion at the 1937 International Exhibition in Paris. One hand of each figure holds the hammer and sickle, the two symbols of the Soviet Union. In 1947 the sculpture became the symbol of the Russian Mosfilm studio.

b) Elena Mukhina**,** (1960-), gymnast in the late 70's. In training before the 1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow Mukhina broke her neck and was rendered quadriplegic. Her trainer had forced her to train as he wanted to become the 'Olympic Champion's trainer'. Soon afterwards he emigrated to Italy. The Soviet Union awarded Mukhina the Order of Lenin in response to her injury.

Vadim Shershenevich (1893-1942), poet. Theorist and propagandist of futurism. At 21 developed the theory of Imaginism. Together with Mayakovsky wrote texts for the ROSTA[1] posters.

Georgy Zhukov (1896-1974), Soviet military commander and politician.

Ivan Shmelev (1873-1950), successful Russian writer at start of 20th century, exiled in Paris from 1923. Saw Bolsheviks as "sons of the Demon" and his writings were banned in the USSR. In 2000, following initiative of the Russian public, his remains were returned to Moscow and reburied.

Elizaveta Tarakanova (1745-1775), pretender to the Russian throne, sometime known as Princess Tarakanova. Depicted in Flavitsky's painting of 1864 being killed in a flood in1777, although in reality she had died two years previously of tuberculosis.

Boris Babochkin (1904-1975), actor and director, worked for many years in the Leningrad Dramatic Theatre before making his feature film debut in 1927. In 1934 he gained international renown for playing the lead in the landmark Soviet film *Чапаев* (Chapaev)'.

v) Names featuring human qualities: the five authors in this list are 'М.Горький' (горький, bitter), 'Д.Бедный' (бедный, poor), 'А.Поперечный' (поперечный, transverse/diagonal), 'С.Бытовой' (бытовой, everyday) and 'А.Веселый' (веселый, cheerful). The Russian authors stand out in that they are each cited using an initial to denote first names, almost as if we are invited to imagine that they are part of an official roll call of some kind. This is the only occurrence of this happening in the library entries: its significance will be discussed below.

[1] ROSTA: 'Российская Советская Федеративная Социалистическая Республика' Russian Telegraph Agency. The central information organ of the RSFSR created in 1918 and transformed into the *Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union* in 1935. (Crowe:1969)

Maksim Gor'kii (1868-1936), dramatist and prose writer. Born Aleksei Maksimovich Peshkov in Nizhnii Novgorod he adopted Maksim Gor'kii (i.e. 'Maksim the Bitter') as his pen-name largely out of respect for his father (who had died when he was only four years old). Sermonizing rhetoric became a feature of all Gor'kii's overtly political works. Of these, the most famous is his 1907 novel *Мать* (Mother), written for the greater part during a visit to America to raise funds for the Bolshevik cause, depicting in the heroine a mother who adopted the cause of socialism in a religious spirit after her son's arrest as a political activist. Approved by Lenin, the novel acquired fame during the Soviet period for its apparent championing of the proletarian cause. Towards the end of his life, he became an official spokesman for the government and an advocate of socialist realism. The circumstances surrounding his death in 1936 remain obscure. It may have been due to ill health or because he had allegedly incurred Stalin's mistrust and was poisoned on his orders. (Freeborn, R, in Cornwell: 347-8)

Dem'ian Bednyi (1883-1945), poet. Born Efim Alekseevich Pridvorov into a peasant family, he adopted the pen name Dem'ian Bednyi in 1911. "His satirical verse, fables and stories became the mouthpiece of socialist propaganda: for example *Про землю, про волю, про лучшую долю* (About Land, Freedom and the Worker's Lot) from 1917, and *Коммунистическая марсельеза* (The Communist Marseillaise) 1918… During the Civil War Bednyi wrote political jingles, satirical verse and Red Army songs. By aiming at an uneducated audience his poems became hugely popular among the soldiers and peasants. In the early 1920s his verse was used in the crackdown on religion… In 1930 the publication of his poem *Слезай с печи!* (Get off the Stove!) brought his career to a halt. It was seen by officials as a crude portrayal of the Russian populace as a lazy lot… According to M. Kanivez's memoirs, Bednyi was close to Stalin in the mid-1930's, but an informer – Professor Present – penetrated Bednyi's circle and recorded all his conversations with the poet in a diary. Bednyi's criticism of Stalin was reported to the NKVD, which led to official criticism of his work in the press." (Smith, A in Cornwell: 150)

Anatolii Poperechnyi (1934-), poet: Having read Poperechnyi's poem *Солдатки* ('Soldiers'), the composer A. Dolukhanian decided to set it to music and asked the

poet to change the title to 'Madonnas of Ryazan' and to write a refrain. The song became a great favourite world-wide, particularly in Japan and France. In 1960 Poperechnyi became a member of the Writers' Union of the USSR, where he was Secretary to the Komsomol' Organisation.

S Bytovoi: this entry appears to be humorous when read without pause, *сбытовой* (sbytovoi meaning 'selling' or 'marketing' in commercial parlance): hence the inclusion of an initial rather than full forename. We therefore seem to have a 'sell-out' inserted.

Artem Veselyi (1899-1938), writer, real name Nikolai Ivanovich Kochkurov, whose novel *Россия, кровью умытая* (Russia Washed with Blood) about the Civil war put him among the greatest authors of the 1920s-30s. The writer was repressed and executed by the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs in 1938.

vi) Names featuring animals and birds: this longer list contains twelve authors, 'Зайцев' (*заяц*, hare), 'Волков' (*волк*, wolf), 'Медведев' (*медведь*, bear), 'Львов' (*лев*, lion), 'Лиснянская' (*лиса*, fox), 'Орлов' (*орёл*, eagle), 'Соколов' (*сокол*, falcon), 'Сорокин' (*сорока*, magpie), 'Гусев' (*гусь*, goose), 'Курочкин' (*курица*, hen), 'Лебедев-кумач' (*лебедь*, swan) and 'Соловьев-седой' (*соловей*, nightingale).

a) Boris Zaitsev (1881-1972), writer of popular fiction and, following emigration in 1922, prominent member of post-1917 Russian diaspora. "…will probably be best remembered for a handful of short stories published in the first two decades of the 20th century…he is a master of the thumbnail sketch and his portraits of his contemporaries, while never cruel are always pithy." (Pursglove, M. in Cornwell (ed.): 906)

b) Vasilii Zaitsev (1915-1991), Soviet sniper during World War II who between 10th November and 17th December 1942, during the Battle of Stalingrad, killed 225 solders and officers of the Wehrmacht and other Axis armies. Zaitsev grew up in the Ural Mountains and learned marksmanship by shooting deer. His famous

quote "There is no ground for us behind the Volga" is etched on the monument to the defenders of Stalingrad.

Alexandr Volkov (1891-1977), novelist and mathematician, wrote children's books based on *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

Roy Medvedev (1925-), scholar and historian who was purged in 1969 following publication of *Let History Judge*, an attack on Stalin and Stalinism from a Marxist viewpoint. Later oppressed as supporter of pro-Democracy and in 1971 dismissed from his position as Senior Scientist at the Institute of Professional Education in Moscow. Rehabilitated under Gorbachev. His twin is Zhores Medvedev (1925-), biologist and Head of the Dept of Molecular Radiobiology at the Institute of Medical Radiology at Obninsk until his dismissal in 1969. In January 1973 he was offered a year's Fellowship at the National Institute of Research in London and was given permission to leave Russia. But a few months after he arrived in Britain the Soviet authorities deprived him of his citizenship and confiscated his passport.

Nikolai L'vov (1751-1803), architect and poet, known for his buildings in St. Petersburg and his collection of Russian folk songs. The L'vov-Derzhavin circle, starting in the 1770s, was a group of writers who were among the first to depart from classicist notions of art as the imitation of external models, classical or foreign, or as didactic propaganda. To them literature and art in general was neither a craft nor a hobby – it was a fate and a calling.

Inna Lisnianskaia (1928-), poet and translator of Azerbaijani poetry, published in the journal 'Metropol'[1]. Left the Writers' Union in protest against the persecution of Viktor Erofeev and Evgenii Popov.

[1] In 1979 a group of writers, including Andrei Bitov, Evgenii Popov, Fazil' Iskander and Vasilii Aksenov attempted to publish an almanac entitled *Metropol'* without the permission of the Writers' Union. Aksenov was forced into exile and Popov banned from further publication. (Gillespie, D. in Cornwell (ed):62)

Yuri Orlov (1924-), nuclear physicist, founded the Moscow Helsinki group in 1976 to monitor Soviet adherence to the Helsinki human rights accords. Was arrested in 1977 and sent to a Siberian gulag. He was deported to the USA on his release in 1986.

Aleksandr (Sasha) Sokolov (1943-), prose writer who went on hunger-strike to obtain an exit visa from Soviet authorities following a ban on his marriage. Emigrated to Canada in 1976. "His short prose and verses are less important than the novels, and his reputation now seems likely to rest principally on the subtle grace, charm and lyrical profundity of *Школа для дураков* (A School for Fools)". (McMillan, A. in Cornwell (ed): 755-6)

Vladimir Sorokin (1955-), prose writer associated with the Conceptualist[1] movement in Russian avant-garde art. Began writing in the 1970's but his work was banned during the Soviet era and he remained unpublished in Russia until the early 1990s. "A common feature of all his works is the desire to shock and disgust, both in his use of language and in the breaking down of all sexual and social taboos. Clearly influenced by the absurdist writings of the OBERIU[2] writers of the 1920s, Sorokin extends their preoccupation with irrationality and senseless violence to chart the breakdown of public morality and the collapse of a society." (Gillespie, D. in Cornwell (ed): 780)

Viktor Gusev (1909-1944), lyricist who provided the words for many Soviet military songs.

Vasilii Kurochkin (1831-1875), poet and translator noted for his satirical poetry.

[1] *Conceptualism* – 'Postmodernist tendency in late 20th century Russian literature.' (Cornwell (ed):xxxix)

[2] *OBERIU* – 'Association of Real Art: *Объединение реального искусство* - avant-garde artistic movement operating in Leningrad, late 1920s-early 1930s, headed by Daniil Kharms and Aleksandr Vvedenskii.' (ibid)

Vasilii Lebedev-Kumach (1898-1949), poet and lyricist of Soviet times. Wrote numerous songs, the most famous being probably *Песня о Родине* 'A Song about the Motherland'

Vasilii Solov'ev-Sedoi (1907-1979), composer of film music and songs including *Подмосковные вечера* (Evenings Outside Moscow)[1], veteran of the conservatory, radio and wartime entertainment brigades.

vii) Names featuring motion: there are three authors in this list, 'Катаев' (*катать*, to roll/wheel), 'Поволяев'(*поволочь*, to drag) and 'Крученых' (*крутить*, to twist/twirl).

Valentin Kataev (1897-1986), prose writer, recipient of the Stalin Prize (second class) in 1945 for *Son of the Regiment*. Founding editor of magazine *Iunost'*, 1955-62. Joined the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1958. "One of the most accomplished prose writers of the Soviet era, a writer whose reputation may have been seriously compromised by innate political conformism, yet whose talent and achievement are beyond dispute". (Russell in Cornwell (ed):420)

Valerii Povolaev (1940-), historian, novelist and journalist, a prolific writer who has written profiles of the Afghan and Chechen wars.

Aleksei Kruchenykh (1886-1968), poet and literary theorist whose reputation has been based primarily on his role as the most radical and consistent of the Russian Cubo-Futurists[2]. "His most famous poem *Дыр бул щыл* (Dyr bul shchyl), written in December 1912 and published March 1913 in the lithographed book *Помаде* (Pomade) was the first work in so-called transrational language *заумный язык*

[1] *Подмосковные вечера*, written in 1956 (words by M L Matusovsky, music by Vasily Solov'ev-Sedoy), was for decades the most famous and popular Russian song. Known in the West as "Moscow Nights" or "Midnight in Moscow" (wrongly suggesting an urban setting), it was the first non-political Soviet song since the 1930s that made its way into Western markets, helped by "a strikingly energetic Dixieland arrangement in the early 1960s by the Englishman Kenny Ball".(Stites:131)

[2] Futurism: 'Iconoclastic avant-garde movement of 1910s' (Cornwell (ed):xxxix)

(zaum) which Kruchenykh championed. It remains one of the most extreme examples of verbal experimentation in Russian poetry."(Janecek, G.J. in Cornwell (ed):469)

viii) Names featuring metal implements: the four authors are'Молотов' (*молот*, hammer), 'Топоров' (*топор*, axe), 'Пильняк' (*пила*, saw) and 'Гвоздев' (*гвоздь*, nail).

Vyacheslav Molotov (1890-1986), Soviet politician and diplomat, a leading figure in the Soviet government from the 1920s, when he rose to power as a protégé of Joseph Stalin, to the 1950s, when he was dismissed from office by Nikita Khrushchev. He was the principal Soviet signatory of the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact of 1939.

Vladimir Toporov (1928-2005), leading Russian philologist who presided over the Moscow-Tartu school of semiotics after Yuri Lotman's death. Among Toporov's many honours were the USSR State Prize (1990) which he turned down to voice his protest against the repressive policies of the Soviet administration in Lithuania; the first ever Solzhenitsyn Prize (1998) and the Andrei Belyi Prize for 2004. He was a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences and many other scholarly societies.

Boris Pil'niak (1894-1938), prose writer. "In the novella *Повесть непогашенной луны* (Tale of the Unextinguished Moon) which appeared in1926 in *Новый Мир* (Novyi Mir), Pil'niak, despite his denial, implied that responsibility for the death of the military hero Mikhail Frunze lay with Party leaders and finally with Stalin himself. Zealots never forgot this egregious transgression that haunted Pil'niak until his early death… in the politically charged post-NEP[1] climate of "intensified class struggle", a vigorous defamation campaign against Pil'niak (and, to a lesser degree, against others) developed into the most extensive and sustained public attack on an author in the history of Russian literature" (Browning in Cornwell

[1] NEP: 'New Economic Policy': limited re-introduction of market economy, following the Civil War, 1921-27 (succeeded by Five-Year Plan for construction of a socialist economy) (Cornwell (ed):xxxix)

(ed):640-641). Arrested on 6 October1937, Pil'niak was found guilty and executed on the same day, 21 April 1938.

Aleksandr Gvozdev (1892-1959), linguistician, specialized in children's acquisition of language.

ix) **Names featuring plants, fruit and vegetables:** of the nine authors' names, two pairs are based on the same source, 'Цветков' and 'Цветаева'(both from *цветок*, flower), 'Розов' and ''Розанов' (both from *роза*, rose), 'Пастернак' (пастернак, parsnip), 'Вишневский' (вишня, cherry), 'Яблочкина' (яблоко, apple), 'Крон' (крона, crown of a tree) and 'Корнейчук' (корень, root).

Alexei Tsvetkov (1947-), wrote poetry for *Московское время* (Moscow Time). In 1975 was arrested and deported from Moscow to the USA. Has worked on Radio Liberty since 1989. In addition to poems his published work includes fiction, essays and translations.

Marina Tsvetaeva (1909-1941), poet and prose writer who left Moscow for abroad in 1922 but returned in 1938. Finding herself ostracized by the literary community, she committed suicide in 1941. Her literary rehabilitation began in the 1960s and has grown greatly since the 1970s. "Her work defies categorization, but she is, if anything, a belated (and highly original) romantic; her main theme is the isolation of the individual in an uncaring world, and especially the tension between women's private emotions and their public roles" (Wells, D.N. in Cornwell (ed.): 833-4)

Viktor Rozov (1913-2004), author and playwright who rose to fame during Khruschev's 'thaw' when his plays were performed to full houses at Moscow's popular Sovremennik theatre. *Летят журавли* (The Cranes Are Flying), a film directed by Mikhail Kalatozov with screenplay by Viktor Rozov, became a world-wide success, winning the Palme d'Or at the 1958 Cannes film festival.

Vasily Rozanov (1856-1919), writer of many works on religious issues, attacking Christianity for what he viewed as its asceticism and its emphasis on sorrow and renunciation. He advocated a naturalistic religion of sex and procreation.

Boris Pasternak (1890-1960), poet, prose writer, essayist and translator, " a rare example of a Russian writer who was established before the Revolution and who continued to function in literature throughout Stalin's rule without seriously compromising his professional integrity… the most serious threat to his position came when he was expelled from the Writer's Union in 1958 in the scandal that followed the publication of *Doctor Zhivago* in the west, and obliged to renounce the Nobel Prize" (Wells, D.N. in Cornwell (ed.): 620).

Vsevolod Vishnevskii (1900-1951), author and playwright, his play *Оптимистическая трагедия* (An Optimistic Tragedy), telling about the turbulent post-revolutionary years in the Navy, brought him popularity and became an important event in the country's cultural life. During World War 2 he became a military correspondent, working in the blockaded Leningrad. His articles, feature-stories and radio addresses boosted the morale of the city's residents and defenders, as did his play *Раскинулось море широко* (Far and Wide Stretches the Sea), which was staged in the besieged Leningrad.

Aleksandra Yablochkina (1866-1964), leading actress of the Malyi Theatre, Moscow for more than 75 years. Specialised in comedy roles and was renowned for the purity of her Russian pronunciation. One of the first to be awarded the title of People's Artist of the USSR (1937).

Ilmari Kron (1867-1960), Finnish musicologist, writer and composer, publisher of over 9000 Finnish folk songs between 1898 and 1933.

a) Alexandr Korneichuk (1905-1972), Ukranian writer, playwright and politician, who became one of the Soviet Union's most prominent literary loyalists. Because of his skill in blending party line with plot, Korneichuk won five Stalin Prizes and a number of political appointments during the 1930s and '40s. His successful 1942 play *Фронт* (Front) was written to Stalin's instructions. After Stalin's death,

he allied himself with Nikita Khrushchev and in 1955 attacked the fallen secret police chief, Lavrentii Beria, in a play called *Крылья* (Wings). It marked the start of Khrushchev's public assault on Stalinism.

b) Nikolai Kornei-Chuk, known as Kornei Chukovskii (1882-1969), critic, memoirist, literary translator, and children's writer. Wrote literary criticism and translated the works of American and English writers into Russian. "In 1901 Chukovskii started writing for *Odesskie novosti*, signing all his work with the pseudonym formed from his last name, erasing both its "peasant" sound and all traces of his father who had abandoned the family when he was three years old…during and after the Stalinist terror, Chukovskii tried to help many people who were arrested or repressed, writing reams of letters to well-connected acquaintances, but he also kept himself out of trouble…in 1957 Chukovskii received an honorary doctorate in philology; in 1962 he won a Lenin Prize for Masterstvo Nekrasova [The Craft of Nekrasov] and became the second Russian honorary doctor of letters at Oxford University. (Forrester, S. in Cornwell (ed): 233-34)

x) Names featuring landscape: two of the five authors in this list are based on the same source, 'Заболоцкий' (*Болото*, swamp), 'Луговской' (*луг*, meadow), 'Полевой' (*поле*, field), and 'Степняк-Кравчинский' and 'Степун' (both from *степь*, steppe).

Nikolai Zabolotskii (1903-1958), poet. "In 1928 founded with Daniil Kharms and Aleksandr Vvedenskii the OBERIU group of writers and performers...many Leningrad writers were arrested early in 1938 in connection with a supposed counter-revolutionary plot "led" by N Tikhonov (who actually remained at liberty). Zabolotskii was lucky to escape with his life, after serious maltreatment and a spell in a prison psychiatric ward. He refused to confess or make any denunciations, and was sentenced to five years in the camps…underrated and often mocked – in Russia and abroad – during his lifetime, Zabolotskii is now generally understood to be among the great luminaries of Russian modernism" (Milner-Gulland, R. in Cornwell (ed): 899-901)

Vladimir Lugovskoi (1901-57), poet. So-called *poputchik*, or 'fellow-traveller'. Wrote the verses for Prokofiev's oratorio *Ivan the Terrible*.

Boris Polevoi (1908-1981), writer and journalist. Born Boris Kampov, found fame during World War 2 as a reporter for *Pravda*. Polevoi had few equals as a propagandist in depicting German savagery or in glorifying Soviet heroism, but his attention to ordinary details lent both credibility and emotion to his words. Many of his accounts begin with such words as "Nothing has been invented". His most successful book was *Повесть о настоящем человеке* (A Story about a Real Man) which appeared in 1946 and became the basis of an opera by Prokofiev as well as winning Polevoi the Stalin Prize in 1951. From 1962 until his death in 1981 he was editor-in-chief of the Soviet magazine for young people *Юность* (Iunost', meaning 'Youth').

.

Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinskii (1851-1895), writer, revolutionary and anarchist, realised effectiveness of terrorism in combating governments. Following the murder of nine policemen in St. Petersburg in 1878, fled abroad and moved to London in 1885 from where he predicted the inevitability of the fall of the Tsarist regime. His book *Жизнь нигилиста* (The Road of a Nihilist) was published in 1889. Seen as a major influence on the international socialist movement.

Fedor Stepun (1884-1965), writer and philosopher, exiled in Germany from 1922 where he was Professor of Sociology at Dresden from 1926 until 1937. In Stepun's work Kantian transcendentalism combines with the principles of religious metaphysics.

xi) Names featuring parts of the body; the final twelve authors comprise this list, 'Носов' (*нос*, nose), 'Глазков' (*глаз*, eye), 'Бровман' (*бровь*, eyebrow), 'Ушинский' (*уши*, ears), 'Лобачевский' (*лоб*, forehead), 'Языков' (*язык*, tongue), 'Шейнин' (*шея*, neck), 'Бородулин' (*борода*, beard, or *бородавка*, wart), 'Грудинина' (*грудь*, chest), 'Пузиков' (*пузо*, belly), 'Телешов' (*тело*, body) and 'Хвостенко' (*хвост*, tail).

Nikolai Nosov (1908-1976), children's writer best known for his trilogy of fairy tales written between 1954 and 1966 featuring *Незнайки* (Neznaika or 'Dunno'): in these stories, communist tendencies prevail: the first book is set in a typical Soviet-like town, the second in a communist utopia whilst the third is a satire of a capitalist state.

Nikolai Glazkov (1919-1979), Soviet poet known for his ironic verse and for jokingly coining the term *самиздат* (samizdat). This came about as a shortening of the publishing house name under which he printed his poetry, namely *Самсебяиздат* (literally 'the by-oneself publishing house').

G. Brovman, literary historian and critic, purged as part of the campaign against 'homeless cosmopolitanism' begun in 1949, mainly but not exclusively aimed at Jews.

Konstantin Ushinskii (1824-1870), anthropologist and educationalist, founder of scientific education in Russia.

Nikolai Lobachevskii (1792-1856), mathematician**,** founder of non-Euclidean geometry.

Nikolai Iazykov (1803-1847), poet who also wrote popular student songs.

Lev Sheinin (1906-1967), playwright and writer of detective novels whilst, from 1935-1950, head of the Investigation Department of the USSR Chief Public Prosecutor's Office. In 1949 wrote the film script for *Встреча на Эльбе* (Meeting on the Elbe) for which he was awarded the Stalin Prize.

Lev Borodulin (1923-), photographer who began his career after the war and who caught images of many different countries whilst working as a sports photographer in the 1960's. Emigrated to Israel in 1982 after having been considered unreliable following condemnation by the Soviet ideologist Mikhail Suslov over one of his pictures: a photograph (officially called *From the High Board*) taken from above of a girl diving was branded by Suslov *летающей ж…* (The Flying Arse).

Natalia Grudinina, poet, witness for the defence at the trial of Iosif Brodskii in 1964.

Aleksandr Puzikov, author of *Зола* (a biography of Émile Zola).

Nikolai Teleshov (1867-1957), writer who focused on lower classes, particularly Siberian peasants. Wrote the tale N*achalo kontsa* 'The Beginning of the End' about the Revolution of 1905-7. In 1912 he was instrumental in organizing the Writers' Publishing House, and post-Revolution became the director of the newly established museum of the Moscow Arts Theatre; he played an exceptional role in the founding and extension of the literary and artistic archives in Moscow.

Alexandr Khvostenko-Khvostov (1895-1967), Ukrainian avant-garde artist and stage designer. From 1920 he designed posters, advertising boards and numerous stage designs for ballets and operas using the techniques of Constructivism[1].

4.2.2.2. Summary

The source text of paragraph (4,5) lists 65 authors, of which only one is a comic invention. The entries contain few names familiar to the western reader not well versed in Russian; some familiar names feature in other paragraphs where the intention is more for humorous effect, based on Benedikt's filing system. In this paragraph the entries have been selected by Tolstaya and the groupings chosen to enable their inclusion in a 'logical' manner. A very few of the entries have proved difficult to verify, and in a couple of instances alternative choices for the chosen entry have been given; however the majority of entries appear clear cut, enabling an analysis to be conducted into the construction of this part of the library.

The first noticeable features are that the authors almost exclusively are Russian or from States belonging to the former USSR and that the authors are in general very

[1] Constructivism was a modern art movement originating in Moscow in 1920, characterized by the use of industrial materials such as glass, sheet metal, and plastic to create non-representational, often geometric, objects.

much of the Soviet era. Only ten entries pre-date the 1917 Revolution; of the remainder, over thirty were alive during the Revolution but half that number for the break-up of the USSR. About twenty entries were distinguished through falling out with the Soviet regime and a similar number were given the State seal of approval. Thus some two thirds of the entries in this paragraph had involvement with the Soviet authorities, either supportive or antagonistic in roughly equal numbers, and this appears as the predominant reasoning or *прueём* (priem) behind construction of the catalogue of names. A further six names were members of the post-Revolution diaspora and could therefore be added to those unsympathetic to the Communist authorities.

In view of the comments made by Tolstaya in the interview, reproduced in the introduction to this chapter, regarding her affinity with pre-Revolution writers, it is relevant that none of the great prose writers of the 19th century or their works appear in these lists of authors: they appear, if at all, in other parts of the library classification where they are lumped in by Benedikt with inappropriate bedfellows.

A further interesting point, given that the author is a prominent female writer, is the predominance of males. Only seven of the authors in the description above are female, and two of these were not writers at all. Another feature is the lack of writers of a religious persuasion, there being an almost complete absence of Christian theological writing, maybe not surprising given the circumstances under which most authors were operating.

4.2.2.3. The Groupings of Authors in the Target Text

The following analyses the list of the translated equivalents of the above in the American publication *The Slynx*. After a brief overview of content, I will argue that the strategy of the translator is consistent with the translation theory of *Skopos* (Vermeer 1986: 269-304) which is a theory of translational action where translation is seen as the particular variety of translational action based on a source text. As any action has an aim, or a purpose (*skopos*), translational action leads to a "target text", and translation leads to a *translatum* (ie the resulting translated text). The aim of any translational action, and the mode in which it is to be realized, are negotiated with the

client who commissions the action. A precise specification of aim and mode is essential for the translator (Vermeer 2000: 221).

From the target text it can clearly be seen that a strategy of **cultural transplantation** (Hervey and Higgins 1992: 29) has been resorted to in paragraph (4,5), in that the 65 authors listed in the source text have been transposed into 100 American equivalents. Here the translator has decided against simply **transliterating** authors' names, whereby certain conventions of conversion would be used to change the phonic or graphic shape of a source text name in order to make it conform to target language patterns of pronunciation and spelling. Instead, cultural transplantation, an extreme degree of cultural transposition, is employed. Here source language authors' names are replaced by indigenous target language names primarily in order to mimic the playfulness and humour with which Tolstaya has chosen to categorise her authors' names, their formation each reflecting some characteristic of family traits, occupation or domicile. As we have noted, lexical exhibitionism is often combined with paronomasia in Russian postmodern prose – that is we experience a play upon words in both their phonetic and semantic connotations. The library scene in Tolstaya's novel presents a highly extended example of such verbal and conceptual manoeuvring.

Such basic connotations are seen to be of foremost importance in Benedikt's mind when he files the books in comparable groupings. The point made is that Benedikt's thought processes operate only at surface level, i.e. his classification is neither alphabetical nor based on subject content. We see for example that the key concept common to the first six source text names (in the first two lists of the source text described above) is **food** (i.e. the three bread items, sausage, full-up and hungry). The target text equivalents also have food as their defining characteristic, thus mimicking the wordplay of the original:- Appleton (apple), Bacon (bacon) Belcher (belch), Blinman ('blin', Russian for 'pancake' and also a mild swear word, ironically appears as an 'exoticism' within this domesticated list – possibly to be seen as a playful allusion to the foregoing conversation about 'bliny' between Benedikt and Olga). This food grouping continues with Cooke ('cook'), Culpepper ('pepper') Honeyman ('honey'), Hungerford ('hunger'), Liverich ('liver'), Pearson ('pears') and Saulter ('salt'). This first grouping comprises 11 items in the target text, compared to 6 in the source text. We see moreover that the target text neatly places the entries in

alphabetical order, beginning with 'A,B,C', something which rather detracts from the chaotic, non-alphabetical spontaneity of the *'X,K,C,I"* (Kh, K, S and G) with which the source text begins. Thus an abecedary device which can be construed as an instrument of postmodernist 'decanonization' in the original novel is lost in the target text; this alphabetical ordering is for the most part maintained throughout the groupings in the translation with only minor exceptions.

The second concept which unites the next three source text authors is that of **unbalanced physical characteristics** (to the side, bent/sloping and crooked). There are eight corresponding names in the target text which respectively can be seen to have **physical characteristics** at their root, namely: 'bald', 'beard', 'hat', 'head', 'skin', 'top', 'head' (again) and 'whisker'. Here the first six items are in alphabetical order with the seventh and eighth only out of alphabetical sequence. It can be noted that, in the source text, most physical features of these types were grouped in the final list 'parts of the body'.

The only other classification of the source text that is reproduced in the target text is that of **metal implements**: the five authors feature 'hammer', 'bolt', 'iron', 'bolt' (again) and spoon. All other groupings in the target text are innovations of the translator. In the first of these the five target text authors are grouped around the concept of **family**: 'father', 'child', 'brother', 'mother' and 'boy', all in strict alphabetical order.

There then follows a large group of sixteen authors whose names are related to characteristics of **walking and talking**: 'amble' 'stride' 'chat' 'doddle' 'do little' 'fleet' 'gabble' 'go' 'hop' 'sit' 'skip' 'stand' 'swift' 'talk' 'walk' and 'whistle'. This is followed by the 'metal implement' classification referred to above, then by further original groupings, **possibilities**: 'can', 'may', 'mood', 'or' and 'who would', and **liquid**: 'bath', 'beer', 'beverage', 'brine', 'damp', 'fountain', 'dew', 'water', 'dry', 'lap', 'wash' (twice) and 'water' (again).

At this point the translator has decided to spice up her classification with an extensive list of eighteen names that appear to have been chosen to shock with their overtones of slang sexual terms and the imagery conjured up therewith, namely

sexual: ‘cock’ (twice), ‘crap’, ‘dick’ (twice), ‘full of love’, ‘go to bed’, ‘hooker’, ‘long fellow’, ‘love’ (twice), ‘sex’ (twice), ‘kiss’, ‘sin’, ‘strange ways’, ‘cock’ (again) and ‘top lady’.

The last three classifications of the target text are more mundane; **weather**: ‘weather’, ‘flood’, ‘fog’, ‘frost’, ‘hail’, ‘rain’, ‘snow’, ‘sun’, ‘weather’ (again) and ‘wind’; **position**: ‘middle’, ‘over’ and ‘under’ and finally **sickness**: ‘coffin’, ‘die’, ‘fever’, ‘lockjaw’, ‘pain’ and ‘raw bone’.

Brief notes on the authors in these lists give are provided below to enable the equivalence of the target text to the source text to be assessed, although this is made more difficult for the British reader by many of the target text names being as unfamiliar as most the Russian names, although a fair proportion will be well-known in America. In drawing up this list it rapidly became apparent that some references are far from clear and indeed a chosen name may not refer to any particular individual.

Unlike the situation with the Russian entries there is no primary source of information; the same qualifications which were given for the other Russian names apply to all the authors below.

i) Food

Victor Appleton, a pseudonym for Howard R. Garis (1873-1962) who wrote 35 of the 38 books in the *Tom Swift* series

Leonard Bacon (1802-1881), American Congregational preacher and writer of *Slavery Discussed in Occasional Essays from 1833 to 1846* (1846), which exercised considerable influence upon Abraham Lincoln,

Supply Belcher (1751-1836), composer, singer, and compiler of tune books. A member of the First New England School, he was dubbed the "Handel of Maine".

Blinman: no obvious reference, suggesting of an invention to fit in with previous text (as noted above).

Alistair Cooke (1908-2004), best known for his weekly BBC broadcast *Letter from America*. His international best-selling book *Alistair Cooke's America* was deemed so valuable by Ronald Reagan that copies were put in every US public library.

R. Alan Culpepper (1946-), author of several books on Christianity

Don Honeyman (1919-), photographer and film-maker. His most famous image is the solarized print of Che Guevara.

J. Edward Hungerford, wrote movie scripts around 1915

William Liverich, pastor. In 1652 the Puritan Colony of Sandwich, Massachusetts, detached eleven families and dispatched them to Huntington, Long Island under the leadership of the Rev. Liverich.

Ridley Pearson (1953-), novelist writing mostly suspense and thrillers. Pearson became the first American to receive the Raymond Chandler-Fulbright Fellowship at Oxford University in 1991.

William Saulter, Art Director for 1930 films.

ii) Physical characteristics

James Baldwin (1924-1987), author of autobiographical novel *Go Tell it on the Mountain*, 1954.

Aubrey Beardsley (1872-1898), English art nouveau illustrator, renowned for his dark and perverse images and grotesque erotica.

Hatcliff: nobody of this name particularly stands out.

Albert Morehead (1909-1966), lexicographer and games expert, Bridge Editor of the New York Times for over 25 years and the editor of many books on games.

Burrhus (B.F.) Skinner (1904-1990), American psychologist who became a successful psychology writer, particularly for his book *Walden Two*, a fictional account of a community run to his behaviourist principles.

Andrew Topsfield**,** Senior Assistant Keeper at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. Has written catalogues, articles, and a thesis on the Udaipur school of Painting.

Alfred Whitehead (1861 - 1947), English-born logician, mathematician and philosopher, a collaborator with Bertrand Russell and author of "Aims of Education" and "Modes of Thought". Moved to America in 1924.

James Whisker, political scientist and author. Professor of Political Science at the University of West Virginia.

iii) Family

Bruce Bairnsfather (1888-1959), English war artist who fought in the trenches in the First World War. While on the Western Front, drew pictures of trench life and created his cartoon character 'Old Bill' which featured in several plays and films in the 1920's and 1930's. During the Second World War he was appointed as an official cartoonist to the American Forces in Europe and contributed drawings for the American Forces newspaper, *Stars and Stripes*.

Vere Childe (1892 - 1957), Australian archaeologist, one of the great theorists and archaeological synthesists of his generation. His books *Man Makes Himself* (1936) and *What Happened in History* (1942) brought him a wide audience.

Nan Fairbrother (1913-1971), English writer and journalist, author of *New Lives: New Landscapes*.

Robert Motherwell (1915-1991), American abstract expressionist painter and a theorist and exponent of the movement. His writing articulated the intent of the

New York school - Jackson Pollock, Willem de Kooning, Adolph Gottlieb, Franz Kline, Arshile Gorky, and others - during a period when their work was often reviled for its departure from traditional representation.

William Littleboy**,** Quaker writer, in 1916 published the pamphlet *The Appeal of Quakerism to the Non-Mystic*. .

iv) Walking and talking:

Eric Ambler (1909-1998), British screenwriter and author of espionage and crime stories.

Sir Richard Bulstrode, (1610-1711), English author and soldier,joined the army of Charles I on the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642. In 1673 he became a resident agent of Charles II at Brussels. Chiefly known for his *Memoirs and Reflections upon the Reign and Government of King Charles I*

Chatterley: *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is a novel by D. H. Lawrence written in 1928.

Doddleton: not found, perhaps an invention.

Dolittle: *The Story of Doctor Dolittle: Being the History of His Peculiar Life at Home and Astonishing Adventures in Foreign Parts Never Before Printed* was written in 1920 by Hugh Lofting.

Christian Fleetwood (1840-1914), soldier, editor and musician. A black non-commissioned officer in the U.S. Army, he was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions during the American Civil War.

Gabbler: *Hedda Gabler* (1890) is a play by Henrik Ibsen (on occasion misspelt 'Gabbler')

Golightly: Holly Golightly appeared in Truman Capote's short novel *Breakfast at Tiffany's*, published in 1958.

Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844–1889), poet and Jesuit priest, recognized posthumously as one of the finest Victorian poets.

Edith Sitwell (1887-1964), poet and writer, some of her poetry in *Facade* being set to music by William Walton.

Fulwar Skipwith (1765-1839), American diplomat who was instrumental in negotiating the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.

Standon: Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902), American women's rights leader, her efforts were largely responsible for the introduction in 1878 of a US constitutional amendment for woman suffrage (Standon is a misspelling).

Jonathan Swift (1667 - 1745), Irish essayist, novelist, & satirist, author of *Gulliver's Travels*.

Talkien: J.R.R. Tolkien (1892-1973), philologist and writer, author of *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings* (Talkien is a misspelling).

Alice Walker (1944-), African-American author and feminist, received the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction in 1983 for *The Color Purple*.

James Whistler (1834-1903), American-born painter and graphic artist, active mainly in England.

v) Metal implements

Oscar Hammerstein II (1895-1960), writer, producer and director of musicals, his collaboration with Richard Rodgers produced *Oklahoma!*, *South Pacific*, *The Sound of Music* amongst others.

Susannah Hornebolt, artist (first recorded artist in England), daughter of the principal painter immediately preceding Hans Holbein. Albrecht Dürer said of her

in 1521: "She has made a coloured drawing of our Saviour, for which I gave her a florin. It is wonderful that a female should be able to do such work."

Ironquill: Eugene Fitch Ware (1841-1911), Kansas poet, known as Ironquill after he published a book of poems *The Iron Quill* which brought him fame throughout the State.

Henry Newbolt (1862-1938), poet, best remembered for his sea songs *Admirals All* (1897) containing *Drake's Drum*.

John Witherspoon (1723-1794), Scottish-born Presbyterian clergyman, educator, & politician in American Revolution, a signatory of the United States Declaration of Independence.

vi) Possibilities:

Henry Canby (1878-1961), American editor and critic, established and edited (1920–24) the *Literary Review* of the *New York Evening Post,* afterwards joining with others to found and edit (1924–36) the *Saturday Review of Literature*.

Hamilton Mabie (1845-1916), American essayist and critic, his work being published in many magazines and newspapers. Served on the staff of the *Christian Union*, which later became the *Outlook*, eventually becoming its associate editor.

William Moody (1869-1910) American dramatist and poet, author of *The Great Divide*.

George Orwell (1903-1950), real name Eric Blair, British writer whose first book, *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933) described his experiences as a struggling writer. In 1945 Orwell reviewed the anti-Utopian novel *We* by Yevgenii Zamiatin for *Tribune*. The book inspired his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, published in 1949, a pessimistic satire about the threat of political tyranny in the future: many of the new words and phrases used in the book passed into everyday language.

Whowood: an uncommon name, apparently unrelated to any obvious candidate for inclusion in this list. Perhaps a simple play on the phrase 'Who would?'

vii) Liquid:

Bella Bathurst (1969-), British author and journalist who has written for the *Washington Post*, the *Sunday Times* and other major periodicals. Her book *The Lighthouse Stevensons* won the Somerset Maugham Award.

Max Beerbohm (1872-1956), English parodist and caricaturist; in 1911 he wrote Zuleika Dobson, his only novel.

Albert Beveridge (1862 - 1927), historian and United States Senator, known as a compelling orator and one of the great American imperialists, delivering speeches supporting territorial expansion by the U.S. and increasing the power of the federal government.

Brine: Manning O'Brine**,** (1915-), Irish thriller writer and television screenplay writer, all of his novels concern fictional secret agents. The story is told that O'Brine was a former British secret agent who killed his first Nazi in Heidelberg in 1937 and his last one in Madagascar in 1950.

Sir William Dampier-Whetham (1867 - 1952), British scientific writer, author of *The recent development of physical science*.

Jean de la Fontaine (1621-1695), French poet whose *Fables* are world renowned.

John Dewey (1859 – 1952), American philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer, recognized as one of the founders of the philosophical school of Pragmatism, a pioneer in functional psychology, and a leading representative of the progressive movement in U.S. education during the first half of the 20th century.

John Drinkwater (1882-1937), English poet and dramatist, his first real success writing for the theatre came in 1918 with *Abraham Lincoln*. He followed this with *Mary Stuart* (1921), *Oliver Cromwell* (1921) and *Bird in Hand* (1927), a popular comedy.

John Dryden (1631-1700), poet, one of the leading neo-classical (Augustan) poets who, in an attempt to move away from the work of the Elizabethan poets, drew inspiration from Roman poets such as Ovid, Horace and Juvenal. The first official Poet Laureate.

Lapping: no readily forthcoming 'author'

Shipwash: ditto

Livia (L.J.) Washburn (1957-), American writer, author of the *Lucas Hallan* mysteries, also writes romances under the names of Livia Reasoner and Elizabeth Hallam.

Keith Waterhouse (1929-), British novelist and newspaper columnist. His 1960 book *Billy Liar* was subsequently filmed by John Schlesinger.

viii) Sexual:

Addicock: not found.

Claud Cockburn (1904-1981), British radical journalist with communist sympathies, and three sons Alexander Cockburn (1941-), Andrew Cockburn(1947-) and Patrick Cockburn (1950-), also journalists.

Adelaide Crapsey (1878-1914), American poet. Her interest in rhythm and metre led her to create a varation on the cinquain (or quintain), a 5-line form of 22 syllables influenced by the Japanese haiku and tanka.

Charles Dickens (1812 - 1870), English writer of *A Christmas Carol*, *Great Expectations*, *Oliver Twist* etc.

Emily Dickinson (1830-1886), American lyrical poet, the 'Belle of Amherst', an obsessively private writer -- only seven of her some 1800 poems were published during her lifetime. Dickinson withdrew from social contact at the age of 23 and devoted herself in secret to writing.

E.G. Fullalove, real name Ehryck F. Gilmore, a self-acclaimed hypnotherapist, life coach and author, most successful recording is *Didn't I Know: (Divas To The Dance Floor Please)*.

Jabez Gotobed, author of *Gotobed on Darts* and *Darts: Fifty Ways to Play The Game.*

Richard Hooker (1554-1600), theologian, a founder of Anglican theological thought whose most well-known work *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* explains and defends every aspect of Anglican worship and religious theory and practice.

Henry Longfellow (1807-1882), American poet, educator, linguist, author of *The Song of Hiawatha* (including *Hiawatha's Childhood*) 1855

Richard Lovelace (1618–1657), English Cavalier poet, remembered almost solely for much-quoted lyrics, *To Althea, from Prison* and *To Lucasta, Going to the Wars*.

Vicki Loveridge, food technician, author of *Effect of Irradiation Dose, Temperature and Fat Level on the Color Intensity and Textural Characteristics of Beef Rolls* (August 1999).

Middlesex: no well-known writer with this name.

Anne Sexton (1928-1974), American poet and playwright whose work encompasses issues specific to women. Winner of Pulitzer Prize in 1967.

Simpkiss: unable to find clear choice of author with this name.

Lanny Sinkin, lawyer from Hawaii, marine mammal activist and writer.

Edward Strangewayes, British poet, author of *The Messiah; or, The Redemption of Man,* (1830).

Sweetecok: Not found.

Augustus Toplady (1740-1778), Christian Minister, poet and writer of hymns including *Rock of Ages*.

ix) Weather:

Lori Fairweather, author of suspense novel *Blood and Water*, 1999.

Grattan Flood (1857-1928), Irish musicologist and historian, given the title Chevalier by Pope Benedict XV in 1917, and thereafter called Chevalier Flood by his close friends and admirers.

Phileas Fogg, fictitional character in *Around the World in Eighty Days* (1872) by French author Jules Verne (1828-1905).

Robert Frost (1874-1963), American poet, awarded the Pulitzer Prize four times. Frost recited his poem, "The Gift Outright", on January 20, 1961 at the inauguration of President John F. Kennedy.

Haleston: Roy Halston Frowick, also known as Halston (1932-1990), clothing designer of the 1970s.In 1977 brought new sophistication to the airline industry

when commissioned by Braniff Airlines to design new uniforms for the employees as well as interiors and public spaces. (Not Haleston).

Thomas Rainborough (1610 -1648), leading figure in the English Civil War. He was the highest ranking supporter of the Levellers in the Army and one of the speakers for the Leveller side in the Putney Debates (July 1647), where he opposed any deal with the King.

Earl of Snowdon (1930-), British photographer and documentary filmmaker, born Antony Armstrong-Jones. He was married to Princess Margaret from 1960 to 1978.

Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925), Chinese revolutionary and political leader, developed a political philosophy known as the Three Principles of the People (nationalism, democracy, and the people's livelihood/welfare).

Roy Weatherby, gunmaker, founder in 1945 of Weatherby Inc., best known for its high-powered magnum cartridges.

John Wyndham, (1903-1969), British science fiction writer, best known as the author of *The Day of the Triffids*.

x) Position:

Arthur Middleton (1742– 1787), a signatory of the American Declaration of Independence.

Thomas Overbury (1581-1615), poet and essayist, poisoned at the instigation of The Countess of Essex.

Paco Underhill, retail anthropologist, author of *Why We Buy: The Science of Shopping*.

xi) Illness

William Sloane Coffin (1924-2006), clergyman and peace activist, became famous while at Yale in the 1960s for his opposition to the Vietnam War. He was jailed nine times as a civil rights 'Freedom Rider', indicted by the government in the Benjamin Spock conspiracy trial, and has been immortalized as the Rev Sloan in the *Doonesbury* comic strip

Wayne W. Dyer (1940-), author and speaker in the field of self-development, called the "father of motivation" by his fans.

Anne Dorothy Slingsby Feversham, Countess of Feversham (1910-), author of *Strange Stories of the Chase: Stories of Fox Hunting and the Supernatural*.

Lockjaw: not a well-known author.

Thomas Paine (1737-1809), pro-American writer and author of some of the most persuasive texts of the American Revolution. In these texts, he used "plain" language in an attempt to engage people of all classes in the struggle for American independence and for a rejection of government based on hereditary monarchy.

Martin Rawbone, author of *Ford in Britain: A History of the Company and the Cars*

4.2.2.4. Summary

The target text has 100 entries compared to the 65 of the source text, but many are difficult to place making an accurate numerical analysis impractical. There are however many interesting differences between the constructions of the two lists (source text and target text) that can be identified with a view to assessing the impact on the respective readerships of the two catalogues.

The first difference relates to the home territory of the authors: the source text is almost entirely domestic, but the translator appears to exhibit anglophile tendencies with many British entries and some from further afield, represented through Australia and China. A case could be made for the target text to replicate the source text by

choosing entirely American authors which would resonate with an American readership: although such a list might appear incongruous in an obviously Russian book set in Moscow, arguably it would be no more so than the target text as presented.

The next comparison is with the eras in which the authors were active: the source text leans heavily toward the Soviet period, as well as the Revolutions which marked its beginning and end. Such upheavals are not a feature of recent American history, and one would have to go back to the War of Independence and the Civil War for a realistic comparison; however it could make sense to introduce the profound change to society caused by the Civil Rights movement and even the effects of the Vietnam war, both of which inspired recent writers of repute. In practice the timescales of the authors chosen in the target text are widely spread, with some going back to the American wars, but some go back further still (there are four entries relating to the English Civil War, suggestive of the translator introducing items from a period of history in which she has a particular interest). From recent conflicts there is a war artist from World War 2 and an anti-Vietnam protestor, but in general the target text entries are far more spread out historically and do not invoke the concentrated viewpoint of a particular era of history.

As described above, two thirds of the source text authors either fell out with or were supported by the Soviet regime. There is no similar concentrated dichotomy in the target text, obviously as the American government has never resorted to the censorial activities of its Russian counterpart. However the lack of a clearly defined axiom for the choice of authors in the list, and the lack of well-defined conflicts between those chosen, contributes to the lack of impact of the target text compared to the original.

A further difference emerges in the significant numbers of female authors and Christian writers in the target text compared to the source text. Undoubtedly this reflects differences in culture between the USA. and Russia before and during the Soviet era, but so marked is the comparison that the implication is the translator is drawn to these particular sources and has imposed her ‘signature’ on the target text.

A final comparison is a general one on the choice of materials. Apart from one humorous item, the source text gives the impression of items having been chosen in earnest to meet a particular schedule of the author, and Benedikt's classification has then been worked round this. In the target text the translator has made her own classifications but has then included what can only be considered frivolous items (if they even exist in reality) amongst the more renowned authors. Furthermore, some 'authors' are plainly characters from novels and some are given mistaken spelling: this combined with the 'sexual' category, with its unsubtle innuendos, leaves the impression that this paragraph is a piece of light reading with no hidden context. It is as if, having struggled to make sense of the other paragraphs of source text that are laden with humour, the translator has elected to make light of the one paragraph of source text with serious undertones. It is suggested that this contrast of styles between the source and target texts is the reason why the source text repays study for its construction and concepts whereas the target text can be passed over as merely a list of little structure or import.

Chapter 5: Differences between Two Translations of *Кысь*

The availability of a second translation of *Кысь* (Tolstaya 2002), with the target language French, makes it possible to make a comparison between two translation styles. In this chapter the primary interest is in the differences in the impressions the two translations make on the respective target audiences, and clearly there are limitations on the results: for an English-speaking reader, the power of a translation into French must be a matter of some conjecture given the differences in the structures of the two languages. Nevertheless there are clear differences in approach that can be appreciated by an audience with a restricted knowledge of French, as this chapter will demonstrate.

The approach I have taken may seem somewhat alien in that I compare the translations initially without reference to the source text. There are academic precedents for this methodology in the field of Translation Studies and these are detailed: I would stress that the purpose of this chapter is not a test of the adequacy of the translations (although questions will arise in this regard), but an assessment of the differences which are plainly visible when two translators appear to be working to different translation norms. This will lead to conclusions important to my thesis, namely that if this particular novel is translated subject to certain translation constraints, then the end result inevitably limits the effect of the novel and diminishes the efforts expended in its translation.

5.1. Introduction

This chapter examines certain key differences in the approach to translating *Кысь* between the English-language target text of the American translator Jamey Gambrell (Tolstaya 2003a) and the French-language target text produced by the Polish-born translator Christophe Glogowski (Tolstaya 2002). Some of these, immediately obvious through a cursory glance at the two translations, will be analysed in the next section. Thereafter certain passages, specially chosen to highlight differences in approach, will be examined in some depth to indicate the differences in reader-perception induced by the two target texts. This is followed by

a comparison of the two translations of the library scene which was described in detail in the last chapter. The final section looks at the translations of a complete chapter and makes some surprising discoveries as the translators strive to make sense of a collection of jokes, politically-incorrect rants and bawdy obscenities (the rationale for which in the source text I will endeavour to explain).

Page references in this chapter will be abbreviated: the Russian original (Tolstaya, 2000) will be denoted by 'R', the French translation (Tolstaya, 2002) by 'F' and the English (Tolstaya, 2003a) by 'E'. All other translations are my own.

5.2. Visible Differences in the Translations/Paratext

The obvious initial observation is to point out not a difference but the similarity in the titles of the translations (*The Slynx* and *Le Slynx*). Clearly this is no coincidence: Gambrell has translated Tolstaya's texts since1992 and Glogowski, as he makes clear in his foreword (see later), was working with Tolstaya's support.

Gambrell commences her translation with a glossary preceding the text of the translation. In this are defined seven words of Russian extraction which feature prominently in the text but whose meaning would be obscure to her readership: these are (with Gambrell's definitions) *Blin* (*bliny*, pl): large, thin pancake, rather like a crepe, *Golubchik* (m), *Golubushka* (f): my good fellow, my dear, often used ironically. In the novel it is used as a form of address, in the manner of "comrade", *Izba*: small cottage or peasant hut, something like a log cabin, *Kvas*: fermented drink, slightly sweet, *Lapty*: pl, shoe or slipper (sic) made of bast, usually worn by peasants[1], *Murza*: Tatar feudal lord, and *Terem*: mansion or large house, often several stories high (E: glossary). (Chambers Dictionary lists *blini* (sic) and *kvass* (sic) but not the other five words: in Russian; *blin* is also a swear word, expressing annoyance by alliance with *blyad'* meaning whore.)

[1] Although the glossary refers to *lapty* as 'a shoe' etc (singular), the correctly transliterated singular would be *lapot'* (m), with the plural accordingly being *lapti*. This many be translator error, as both the singular and plural of *blin* are correctly supplied. Alternatively it may be translator intervention, in the sense of offering an acceptably playful word with English diminutive 'y' suffix.

At the end of the book is a list of the poetry quoted in *The Slynx*, all translated by Jamey Gambrell. Apart from this there are no translator's notes: the translated text is entirely without footnotes or any other form of explanation. The translator's unwillingness to explicitate extends to the chapter headings which are simply reproductions of the Cyrillic letters of the old alphabet with their respective names transliterated into Roman capital letters. Nor is a 'Table of Contents' supplied.

After a sentence to indicate that he has translated all the Russian poetry quoted in the text, Glogowski precedes his translation with a foreword by the translator (reproduced below) and follows up with a liberal number of translator's footnotes inserted throughout the text at the bottom of the page where the item being commented on occurs. These commence immediately with a note against the title of the first chapter *Az* referring the reader to a footnote which indicates the derivation of the chapter headings throughout the book. This brief explanation underlines the translator's attention to detail and reads as follows: 'The titles of the chapters (*Az, Buki*, *Vedi*, etc.) are the names of the letters of the archaic Slav alphabet created in the 9th century and used in Slav Orthodox sacred texts and old Russian manuscripts (for non-sacred use, the alphabet was reformed in Russia in 1708 and again in 1918)'(F: 9). Almost immediately a second reference note occurs against the distorted word form *drets* (meaning *droits,* 'straight'), referring the reader to the 'glossary of the language spoken by the *mignons* living in the town of Fedor-Kuz'michsk'(F: 9). (The section of text to which this footnote refers will be examined in detail in the next section of this chapter.) The glossary itself is at the very end of the book and contains 48 distorted or historical forms of common French words and phrases (subsequently referred to as *mignons-language* in this chapter). Contained in the glossary are the words *mignons/mignonnes* (the equivalent of Gambrell's Golubchiks/Golubushkas) and defined as the non-serf inhabitants of the town of Fedor-Kuz'michsk (F: 405/6); in standard French, the words mean (as a female plural noun) 'ladies of a kind and amicable nature' and, as a male plural noun, 'favourites' with historical connotations since '*les mignons de Henri III*' were the King's favourite homosexuals. Subsequent footnotes throughout the text provide details of the Russian poetry, historical and geographical references as well as lexical definitions; these include the words

featuring in Gambrell's glossary. The effect of some of these footnotes on the translation will be examined later in this chapter.

We note that the Russian source text contains no footnotes of any kind and indeed does not even acknowledge the writers of the poetry quoted in the text. Taking into consideration Genette's definition of paratext as a 'certain number of productions, themselves verbal or not, like an author's name, a title, a preface, illustrations' which 'surround and prolong' the text, and serve to 'make it present, to assure its presence in the world, its "reception" and its consumption, in the form, nowadays at least, of a book' (Genette 1991: 261) it becomes clear that the Russian original appears to actively subvert all notions of conventional attractiveness. The original is printed on thin, brownish, unbleached newsprint-quality paper with black cover-boards and two sepia illustrations – on the front that of the settlement of Fedor Kuz'michsk and on the back a small, stern photograph of the author. There is no preface. As paratext is furthermore 'defined by an intention and a responsibility of the author' (ibid) the reader has a clear sense of warning from the author that something unsettling lies ahead.[2]

To the extent that her translation is similarly sparse on supplementary information, Gambrell's translation is much closer to the spirit of the original than Glogowski's; however it is not realistic to expect the average American reader to have anything like the background knowledge of their Russian counterpart regarding the events referred to in the book. In this respect it must be assumed that the implications of some events described in the source text which resonate with the Russian reader cannot be fully appreciated by someone with an American background; how the American translator copes with this problem will be examined in some examples which follow. Glogowski's attitude may be discerned from his foreword, translated here in full except for the poetry quoted therein:

[2]Genette also points to the varying duration of paratext, subject to the decision of the author or outside intervention, a circumstance linked to its functional nature. In the second Russian edition of Kys' the paper quality is improved and is white. In the third edition the book is completely redesigned, although all three cover designs are by Tolstaya's son, Artemii Lebedev. The subsequent paperback edition (2007) is different again.

> ‘How can one translate into French the archaic, earthy Russian spoken by the majority of characters in *The Slynx*? To leave anything out would be to empty the book of its vitality, since this antediluvian way of speaking doesn’t just offer a permanent supply of the author’s humour, but asserts itself through the thread of the pages as the paradoxically logical idiom for the passengers of a Ship of Fools, rescued from the dismantling of the USSR, cast into time and out of time, mutants afflicted by the consequences of the big ‘Explosion’, consequences which make them look like the monsters of Hieronymous Bosch. And it is precisely the implicit reference to the world of Bosch which has prompted the translator to have recourse to some elements of Old French of the 16th century (partially, of course, in the manner of the original, which uses elements of the old and rustic Russian). A thrilling experiment, albeit perilous, and we have risked it, with the approval of the author, in order to safeguard linguistically the playful and lively spirit of *The Slynx*.
>
> Under skies where constellations with preposterous names shine, in landscapes peopled by fantastic fauna and flora, in this universe where aberrant ‘post-nuclear’ customs figure alongside authentic vestiges of old folklore, the quest – oh how touching under the grotesque mask – for innermost truth, of which the past and the Russian soul would be the trustees, goes to a great extent beyond the national context. In the background we can discern *The Aleph* by Borges and *Fahrenheit 451* by Bradbury (not to mention the shadow of Père Ubu). And the verses of Natalia Krandievskaia (the author’s grandmother) […] echo the grating questioning of Rabelais: *How do you recognize the madness of the past? How do you recognize the wisdom of the present? (...) What evil gave us the madness that has gone before? What good will give us the wisdom which succeeds it?*’ (F: 7-8 trans. LCK)

This brief summary highlights obvious, highly-visible differences between the styles of the translators, particularly Glogowski’s willingness to use paratext - firstly, by providing references to try and explain to his readership alien features of the source text and the cultural background which surrounds it and secondly, by distorting the target language. Also supplied is a Table of Contents. This compares with Gambrell’s apparent silence regarding each of these features.

5.3. The translations contrasted

5.3.1 Introduction

The next three sections examine certain passages of the book to contrast the two styles of translation. Initially the comparison is made without any reference to the Russian source text in order to bring out the main differences between the target texts; this follows the approach of Baker (2000: 245), as referred to in chapter 3, where translators' styles are compared with each other without reference to the source text in order to highlight individual translators' techniques – the 'characteristic use of language […] and individual profile of linguistic habits, compared to other translators' (ibid). Only once this comparison has been completed is the source text introduced in order to highlight the decisions the translators have had to make. This approach follows the method advocated by Kenny (2005: 162) who argues that "source texts can indeed be integrated into research programmes more normally associated with target-oriented comparable corpora" to highlight any evidence of tendencies towards explicitation or implicitation in translation.

5.3.2. Examples of distortion of target language.

As described above, the first reference in Glogowski's translation to his glossary of *mignons-language* appears on page one, in the third sentence. The book's first sentence is a description by the implied author of Benedikt preparing for the day ahead, written in past tense. The second and third sentences read, firstly in Gambrell's translation:

> *Ah, what a day! The night's storm had passed, the snow gleamed all white and fancy, the sky was turning blue, and the high* ***elfir*** *trees stood still.* (E: 1)

and in French:

> *Fameuse journée ! La tempête de neige nocturne s'est apaisée, la neige s'étale aussi blanche qu'épaisse, le ciel bleuit, les grands* ***klels*** *se dressent bien* ***drets****- nulle branche ne frémit.* (F: 9)

which can be translated as: 'Superb day! The night's snowstorm has calmed down, the snow lies all over both white and deep, the sky's turning blue, the tall klels (or maplefirs) stand up dead straught- not a branch quivers' with the word 'straight' distorted (*drets* for *droits* as noted above).

Two differences are apparent: firstly, following the exclamation the French text remains in the present tense (the historic present) whereas the English reverts to the past and, secondly, the French incorporates a distorted word whereas the English does not. Although the third sentence is narrative, the French gives the impression that it is actually a continuation of the exclamation being spoken by one of the *mignons*, namely Benedikt. In the English translation the narrator reverts to a detached style after the exclamation and use of the past tense rather weakens and distances the narrator's relation to the scene.

In both translations the names given to the type of tree, *elfir* (Gambrell) or *klel* (Glogowski), are neologisms.

The third sentence in the Russian source text reads as:

> *Эх, и хорошо же! Ночная вьюга улеглась, снега лежат белые и важные, небо синеет,* ***высоченные клели*** *стоят - не шелохнутся.* (R: 5)

Gloss: 'Ah how lovely it is! The blizzard during the night had died down, the snows lie white and grand, the sky is turning dark blue and the **tall klels** stand stock-still', with the word for 'tall' being distorted in the source text.

The Russian text uses the word ***вьюга*** which is a particular type of storm, namely a 'snowstorm' or 'blizzard', and is therefore specific, as opposed to many other types of storm which can be specified in Russian, using *буря* rainstorm/tempest, *гроза* thunderstorm, *метель* snowstorm, *буран* a snowstorm (in steppes) *ураган* a hurricane or *вихрь* a whirlwind (Offord 1996:8). Thus a more specific translation of 'blizzard' would offer the reader a richer visual image. This is not reflected in the English translation, which offers a non-specific 'storm' leaving behind curiously 'fancy' snow. In an attempt to mirror the use of the

specifically colloquial and informal Russian word ***высоченные*** for ***высокие*** (meaning 'tall'), the French translation offers a distorted version of the word *droit* (straight), whereas the English again does not, preferring the normalised adjective *high*. The French translation also follows the use of the present tense in the source text, thus invoking the presence of the narrator, and accordingly signalling the presence of an audience. As Tynianov writes of *skaz*, it:

> '… makes the word physiologically palpable; the entire story becomes a monologue, it is addressed to each reader – and the reader enters into the story, begins to declaim, to gesticulate, to smile; he doesn't read the story, but plays it. Skaz introduces into prose not the hero but the reader.' (Tynianov in May, 1994b: 37)

The neologism *клел* is a stump compound, based on initial stumps of the Russian words *клён* (a maple tree) and *ель* (a fir tree). The French translation simply transliterates the Russian, and the English uses the invented clipped compound 'elfir', adopting a phonetic representation of the last two letters of the word 'maple' and the complete English word 'fir'. Evident too is the problem in English of the inappropriateness of using the word 'elf' (denoting smallness) to describe tall trees.

A second example later in the first chapter sees a distorted word form appear in both the English and French translations. The passage describes an acrimonious argument which took place some time ago between Benedikt's late mother, a survivor of the explosion, and his father who was born subsequent to that event. The English reads:

> *Mother would say to him: "Don't you dare lay a finger on me! I have a university education!"*
> *And he'd answer: "I'll give you an ejucayshin! I'll beat you to a pulp".* (E: 11)

while the French is:

> *Mère lui disait:*
> *N'ose pas lever la main sur moi! J'ai fait des ÔTUDES ONIVERSITAIRES!*
> *À quoi il rétorquait:*

- *Attends un peu, je m'en vais te les ôter, tes " ôtudes"! Je m'en vais t'étriller jusqu'à l'os!* (F: 24)

Alliteration of 'o' features strongly in the distortion of *études universitaires* (university studies) to 'OTUDES ONIVERSITAIRES' picking up on the 'o' of 'oser' (to dare). The point to note is that the distortion occurs in the reported speech of the educated mother and is repeated by the non-comprehending father. This contrasts with Gambrell's translation where the mother's speech is reported in non-distorted form with the word 'education' being distorted in the father's subsequent rant. The effect is that the narrator gives the impression of being an outsider, someone who appreciates the difference between the two versions of the word; this is in contrast to the French text where the narrator, presumably Benedikt, has no idea what the mother means.

The Russian version of events is:

Матушка ему:
- Ты меня пальцем тронуть не смеешь! У меня ОНЕВЕРСТЕЦКОЕ АБРАЗАВАНИЕ!
А он:
- А я вот тя сейчас отшелушу: "абразавание"! Я тя собью с пахвей! (R: 19)

The distortion here occurs in the words 'university education', a concept alien to Benedikt and therefore reported as misheard. The fact that Benedikt is the narrator is underlined by the introductory phrase *Матушка ему* 'Motherkins to him', with ellipsis of the verb, a common linguistic feature of Russian *сказки* (Costello D P & Foote I P (eds) 1967:xiii).

One of the recurring features of the book is the failure to understand pre-explosion words and expressions by those born after. The reader of the Russian source is warned of an impending collision of understanding through the distorted word(s) appearing in upper-case letters, as in this example. The French translation faithfully reproduces this device: the English translation never does.

A final example is taken from Chapter 4, a conversation between Benedikt and a pre-explosion survivor, the Head Stoker, Nikita Ivanovich. Gambrell's translation is as follows:

> *"What're you up to, Nikita Ivanich?"*
> *"Eating honeycomb."*
> *"Hummycum?"*
> *"What bees make."*
> *"Are you crazy?"*
> *"Just try it. You people eat mice and worms, and then you're surprised to see so many mutants."*
> *Benedikt got scared, he froze and finally left feeling a bit queasy, in a fog. It was frightening: the old man had gone by his own self and messed with the bees in the tree hollow ... Then, of course, Benedikt told the others. They only shook their heads. "Sure. The bee shits, and we're gonna eat it?"* (E: 29)

Glogowski's translation runs:

> *Qu'est-ce que vous faites, Nikita Ivantych?*
> *Je mange du MEL.*
> *De quel MEL parlez-vous ?*
> *Eh bien, de celui que produisent les abeilles.*
> *N'auriez-vous point perdu la raison ?!*
> *Goûte plutôt. À bouffer des souris et de vers comme vous le faites, ne vous étonnez pas si les mutations se multiplient.*
> *Benedikt se renfrogna, tourna les talons et sortit, l'air offusqué. Il se sentait tout chose et marchait au hasard. Y avait de quoi être choqué : le vieux, de ses propres mains, avait fouillé dedans un nid d'abeilles… Plus tard, évidemment, Benedikt relata la chose aux autres hommes. Ils hochèrent la tête :*
> *Ben voyons! Il ne manquerait plus que nous bâfrions de la merde d'abeille!* (F: 51/2)

The mutation here is of the French word *miel* meaning honey. It appears first in the reported speech of the old man and is repeated by Benedikt. This contrasts with the English where the initial statement of the word 'honeycomb' is again reported accurately in the words of the old man.

Following the reported conversation, the narrator in both translations adopts a style sympathetic to Benedikt, using past tense and proper word forms. However there is a contrast in the type of language used by Benedikt's friends in the

concluding sentence of this extract. Gambrell utilises a rhetorical response with a modern feel to it (e.g. the words 'sure' and 'gonna', both expressions of North American extraction, the first indicating positive acceptance and the second a contraction of 'going to'). In the French translation, the first word of the reaction of Benedikt's friends *Ben* is an old rustic form of *Bien* (meaning 'well'): the suggestion of old-fashioned agricultural language prepares the way for a coarse remark based on ignorance.

What remains unexplained is why the reference to bees and honey produces such palpable disgust amongst Benedikt and the others. The source text is:

> *- Вы что это, Никита Иваныч?*
> *- МЁТ ем.*
> *- Какой МЁТ?*
> *- А вот что пчелы собирают.*
> *- Да вы в уме ли?!*
> *- А ты попробуй. А то жрете мышей да червей, а потом удивляетесь, что столько мутантов развелось.*
> *Бенедикт припужнулся, весь замрел и вышел бородой вперед, сам не свой, не разбирая дороги. Страх-то какой: старик самолично к пчелам в дупло лазил... Потом, конешно, мужикам рассказал. Только головой покрутили. - Ну да. Пчела гадит, а мы ешь за ней?!* (R: 44)

Distortion first occurs in the reported words of the old man where *мёд* (honey) is misheard by Benedikt as *мёт*. Again the English translation, by normalising the first occurrence of this word, suppresses the point that we are being invited to hear what Benedikt actually hears himself. Nikita Ivanovich describes honey as that which bees *собирают* (gather) rather than what they 'make', but the reason for the reaction of Benedikt remains obscure. As in the English translation, the reaction of Benedikt's friends comes in the form of a question: "All right then. The bee shits, but we eat it after the bee?!"

These three examples expose how a different handling of the distorted words can, among other things, give a different impression as to the identity of the narrator. Translating into a contrived language is risky if it fails to resonate with the reader of the target text, something Glogowski acknowledges in his foreword. This

strategy can also make the translator uncomfortably visible should it fail to ring true. Visibility is further increased by the use of footnotes, examples of which follow in the next section.

5.3.3. Examples of the Use of Footnotes (Paratext)

As a first example, the following passage from the book comes immediately after the incident with the honey: again the source of confusion is a failure to understand the motives of the old man Nikita Ivanovich, but the references are potentially difficult to follow for the non-Russian reader. The old man has been taking the men to the top of a hill to dig up the ground: the reason for this, according to the English translation, is:

> *"...He said there were mustardpieces buried there. And stone men, humongous white Rowmans and Creeks. We got plenty of our own rowmen, and only one river anyway."*
>
> *That's right, he did take them. He said that in Oldener Times there used to be a Moozeeum on Murka's Hill, and there were shameful white stones buried in the earth. They were carved like men and women, with nipples and everything.* (E: 29)

No footnote is provided, but without any assistance it is possible to work out that they were excavating the site of a former museum which contained Greek and Roman white-stone sculptures of people in various degrees of undress. The first paragraph is reported speech and the second the voice of the narrator: in this case the narrator distorts the word for museum and would appear to be Benedikt. The French translation runs:

> - *...Soi-disant des CHATS D'ŒUVRES y seraient enterrés. Davantaige, y aurait là un bonhomme de pierre d'une taille trop plus qu'humaine, un DAVID moult pesant. Y en a-t-il point à satiété d'iceux qui nous pèsent jà sur l'échine pour qu'on aille encore se charger d'autres ?...*
>
> *Or vrai est qu'il avait emmené des moujiks sur le mont Mourka, Nikita Ivanytch. Soi-disant, y aurait eu là un MISÉE dans l'Ancien Temps[1] et des pierres blanches qui connaissent point la honte y seraient enterrées. Icelles seraient taillées à la ressemblance de bonshommes et de fumelles sans culottes; elles auraient des tétines et tout le reste. Oui-da!*

with the following footnote at the bottom of the page :

1. Il s'agit du musée Pouchkine, à Moscou, où se trouve une copie du David *de Michel-Ange.* (N.d.T) (F: 52)

As in the English translation, the first paragraph is reported speech and the second is the narrator's words. The translator enters a footnote reference just after the distortion of *musée* (museum).

1. The point being that the Pushkin Museum in Moscow has a copy of *David* by Michelangelo. *(Translator's note)*

Because of the footnote, Glogowski has felt able, presumably, to retain the reference from the original to *David*, in which case Gambrell has omitted this material. The French comment about the *David*, linking their annoyance at carrying heavy stones on their backs when they already have plenty of people on their backs (i.e. their rulers), seems contrived, whilst the English version has a pun on Romans and Greeks totally absent from the French. Both translators have introduced a distortion in the first line (*chefs d'œuvres* 'masterpieces' in French mutated to *chats d'œuvres* 'cats pieces') but it is difficult to see what the English reader is to make of *mustardpieces* (presumably masterpieces). The French also contains many examples of *mignons-language* and the crudeness and vulgarity of the narrator makes it clear that this is Benedikt's version of events, a Benedikt in the French translation coming across as coarser and more worldly-wise than the mildly shocked English version – 'white stones that knew no shame at all had been buried there. These ones had been cut to resemble blokes and floosies with no knickers: they'd got tits and all the rest. Yes, rather!'

The word *muzhik* (a Russian male peasant) is a culturally specific word included in the French translation and absent from the English.

The Russian original is:

- ... Мол, ШАДЕВРЫ там погребены. А еще будто там доложон быть мужик каменный, агромадный и сам ДАВИД. А у нас тут есть кому нас давить, лишний-то нам без надобности...

А это точно, он водил. Будто бы на Муркиной Горке МОЗЕЙ был в Прежнее Время, и будто бы там в земле

> *камни белые закопаны, срамные. На манер мужиков и баб обтесаны, беспортошные; и титьки у них, и все.* (R: 44)

No footnotes are provided here (or indeed anywhere else in the source text). *Шадевр* bears considerable resemblance to *шедев*р, a 'masterpiece' and is recognisable as a loan-word, in the same way as the French *chats d'œuvres* for *chefs d'œuvres*, although the English version is more obscure. The Russian reader is able to share in a pun of the figure of David on the similar-sounding word *давить* (to weigh down on, or crush), '…a stone man, an absolutely huge *ДАВИД* himself. But we already have someone to *давить* us, we don't need another one' and will see an allusion to the forces of oppression in a society such as that depicted. The French translation attempts to encapsulate the meaning while the English-speaking reader, with all reference to David omitted, is deprived of the black humour of the piece and is left with a rather forced and lame reference to *Rowmans and Creeks*, a linguistic play on *Romans and Greeks*. The subsequent statement that there were 'plenty of our own rowmen, and only one river, anyway' might then be interpreted as a weak attempt to replicate the irony of the Russian source text.

The use of the colloquial language of *мол* 'he says' or 'says he', and *доложено* 'supposedly' where folk language creates extra syllables in order to sustain rhythm (Costello & Foote (eds) 1967:xiv) is not reflected in the English translation. May (1994b:35) cites Kornei Chukovskii lamenting the loss of vernacular speech in translations 'As you see, it's a pattern. It turns out that not only Ralph Parker but all, positively all the translators flatly refused to translate *prostorechie.* And their Italian colleagues joined them in this' (Chukovskii: 394) with reference to translations of Solzhenitsyn's *Один день Ивана Денисовича* (One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich).

Further evidence of the 'normalisation' of the original text lies in the fact that reference to *беспортошные* 'without pants' is omitted from the English and the vulgar *титьки* 'titties' are more coyly referred to as 'nipples'.

May rightly makes the point that this approach results in 'a flattening of the lexicon and stylistic texture of the work. In the repeated elimination of colloquial language there is another loss, that of the personal communicative force of the text.' (May 1994b: 35). The French translation has attempted to preserve the qualities of the original through use of *mignons-language* and a footnote.

Finally, the inclusion of the word *muzhik* in the French is an insertion by Glogowski as it does not feature in the source text at this point: however, it does occur in the previous paragraph where it is translated as *bonhomme* or 'bloke'.

A second example lies towards the end of the book, at the end of Chapter 30. Benedikt is being cajoled by his father-in-law into accompanying him in an attempted coup d'état. In the English translation the father-in-law is speaking:

> *"... All evil in fact comes from the silent acquiescence of the indifferent. You read* Mumu*, didn't you? Did you understand the moral? How he kept silent all the time, and the dog died."*
> *"Papa, but how-"*
> *"Know-how, that's how. I've thought the whole thing through."* (E: 248)

To the reader without any knowledge of *Mumu* the reference to it does not add to the story, and if anything the exchange is confusing. Is *Mumu* the man who kept silent or is it the dog? Is Benedikt asking how the dog died? What has know-how got to do with it?: father-in-law's response only seems to make sense if he is answering a different question and we have to ask if that is indeed what he is doing: after all, as father-in-law knows, Bendikt has read everything. On the other hand, most of what he has read he has invariably failed to understand: for Benedikt, *The Gingerbread Man* represents a supreme literary achievement, so it is almost certain that the significance of *Mumu* eluded him… The French translation (with a footnote) is:

> *...C'est par consentement tacite des indifférents que se commettent les crimes. Tu as lu* Moumou*, non ? Tu as saisi la parabole ? Il se taisait, ne disait rien*[1]*, et la chienne a péri.*
> *−Papa, mais comment…*
> *−Ne te mets martel en tête, tout est prévu.*

1. Humour noir : le triste héros de cette nouvelle de Tourgueniev est muet. (N.d.T.) (F: 365/6)

The reference to *Mumu* is the subject of a footnote. A translation is:

"… It's with the silent consent of the indifferent that all crime is committed. You've read *Mumu*, haven't you? You got the message of the parable? He was keeping quiet, saying nothing[1], and the dog has perished"

"Papa, but how…"

"Don't worry yourself, everything is foreseen."

1. Black humour: the woeful hero of Turgenev's short story is dumb. *(Translator's note)*

The footnote makes the joke clear, and it appears that Benedikt could be asking how the dog died, a question his father-in-law chooses to ignore and on which the footnote offers no enlightenment. (The dog *Mumu*'s deaf and dumb master took her out in a boat, tied a rock round her neck and threw her overboard so that she drowned). The short story *Mumu* was written in 1852 and is well-known inside Russia as an indictment of pre-Revolution landowners in that country. The French translator decided the story was insufficiently familiar to his readership and thus merited a footnote. The American translator elected to leave the reference without any comment, even though it would be obscure for much (perhaps most) of her readership and as in a previous instance, the *David* statue, she had decided to replace the text with her own version. The Russian text is:

*-...С молчаливого согласия равнодушных как раз и творятся все злодейства. Ты ведь "*Муму*" читал? Понял притчу? Как он все молчал-молчал, а собака-то погибла.*

- Папа, но как...

- Ништяк, все продумано. Революцию сделаем. (R: 342)

In response to Benedikt's unfinished question 'Papa, but how …?' the Russian text gives the reply 'Don't you worry yourself … ' The insertion of 'know-how' by Gambrell can be seen as a weak invention to echo the previous 'how' in the father-in-law's speech.

A final example comes from the very last pages of the book. The old man Nikita Ivanovich is about to be executed by being burned alive. Benedikt's father-in-law shouts out to announce he has completed preparation of the bonfire. The English translation is:

> *"That's it! Out of propeller range! "*
> *"What do propellers have to do with it?" Nikita Ivanich argued irritably. "You haven't invented the propeller yet, you frigging mutants!"* (E: 273)

The reader then has to ask himself what do propellers have to do with the scene? The question goes unanswered in Gambrell's translation. It would appear that father-in-law is shouting to tell the crowd to keep back. The French version provides a footnote:

> *-Paré, dit-il, gare à l'hélice[1] !...*
> *-Que vient faire l'hélice là-dedans ? cria Nikita Ivantych d'une voix courroucée. L'hélice, vous ne l'avez pas encore inventée, bandes de sacripants !*
>
> *1. Locution courante en russe pour dire : « On commence ! » À l'origine, il s'agissait de l'ordre crié par le pilote d'avion au mécanicien au sol, lui enjoignant de lancer l'hélice et de s'en écarter. (N.d.T.)* (F: 397/8)

A footnote follows the reference to 'propeller'. An English translation:

> "That's it ready", he said, "watch out for the propeller[1]"
> "What's the propeller got to do with it?" shouted Nikita Ivantych angrily. "You haven't invented the propeller yet, you gang of scoundrels."
>
> 1. Modern Russian expression meaning "let's get going". Originally referring to the order shouted by the pilot of an aircraft to the mechanic on the ground, calling for him to spin the propeller and get out of the way. (*Translator's note*)

The footnote explains the obscure reference to propeller (an expression of similar derivation to the English 'chocks away'), but both the English and French versions leave the impression of something having been lost in the translation. Another difference between the translations is that the swearing in English is much coarser than in French. The Russian source is:

> *- Все - от винта!..*

- При чем тут винт, - раздраженно крикнул Никита Иваныч, - винт вы еще не изобрели, блудодеи гребаные!
(R: 373)

The word for propeller in Russian *винта* has phallic connotations which links into the invented word *гребаны*, having as its root *ебать* 'to fuck' and the verb *грести* 'to row', suggesting 'row off' or 'go away', which then adds a euphemistic effect to the English 'f-word': this is sanitised in the English translation and reduced to a mild expletive in the French.

It can be seen that the use of footnotes markedly increases the visibility of the translator, something Glogowski has decided to tolerate in order to clarify sections of the novel that would most likely mean nothing to his readership and could have the potential, if occurring frequently, to lessen their understanding and enjoyment of the novel. Gambrell has elected for invisibility, either deviating from the source if it becomes too obscure and inserting her original material, or leaving the translation to read as it stands.

5.3.4. The Library Scene

This scene, the subject of Chapter 4 of this thesis, extends over four pages of the French translation (F: 265/8). Like the source text and the English translation, the lists of authors and books take up fifteen paragraphs. It is not proposed to make a detailed analysis of the library entries, but after a brief review of some of the techniques employed by Glogowski, a fundamental difference in approach compared to Gambrell's will be described: this difference emerges as a result of Glogowski's readiness to use footnotes.

Glogowski eases his readers in to the scene by changing the paragraph order, starting with the straightforward classification 'colour' (the third source-text paragraph) before proceeding to the more complex first source-text paragraph. His approach is similar to Gambrell's in that material which loses its significance in translation is omitted, sometimes with extra original entries being substituted. In one case, Glogowski opts to rewrite a paragraph (the eighth of the source text,

which uses the letters *Клим* (Klim) at the beginning of each item) in order to keep the reference to *Климакс. Что я должна знать?* (Menopause. What should I know?) omitted by Gambrell. Glogowski's paragraph uses the letters 'Men' at the start of each item (Mendel, Mendeleïev, Ménon, Ménopause), thereby losing the jocular entry of K. Li. Maxima …

Glogowski's task is not made easier by the letter *Ч* transliterating into French as Tch (eg Tchekhov) so that the entry 'John Cheever' no longer is appropriate. Cheever is omitted in the French, although a substitute 'Chandler' appears later alongside an invented title *Chandeliers of the XIXth Century*. Glogowski also abandons the repeated onomatopoeic syllable classification of the fourteenth source paragraph by introducing, after 'Gogol'', the curious *Les Goals d'or - histoire du football anglais* (Golden Goals – the Story of English Football).

Where Glogowski's approach is quite different from Gambrell's is in his treatment of the fourth source-text paragraph, the lists of Russian authors. Gambrell substitutes her own classifications and lists of authors, something Glogowski makes no attempt to do. Instead he relies on footnotes to inform his readers of the logic behind the classification in the source text

The source-text paragraph is split into two in the French translation, the first appearing as the fourth paragraph accompanied by a long footnote explaining that the list consists of names of Russian authors which have been rendered into French by a literal translation in order to illustrate Benedikt's library classification. The paragraph starts 'Dupain, Sauciflard, Repu, ...' and runs to twenty-one French surnames. The footnote explains that Dupain ('pain' is bread) is a French approximation of the name Khlebnikov, Sauciflard ('saucisson' is sausage) of Kolbassev, Repu ('remplir' is to fill up) of Sytine etc. The footnote gives all twenty-one Russian names.

Further lists of authors appear as the sixth paragraph of the French translation. Here the approach is to transliterate the Russian names and again provide footnotes. After a list of nine names commencing Tsvetkov, Tsvetaïeva,

Rosov, Rosanov, ... a footnote explains that these are names associated with vegetables (Lafleur, Rosier, etc). Twelve further names follow with another footnote to the effect that these names are associated with anatomy. The footnotes to this paragraph only render four Russian names into their French approximations.

Thus the French lists comprise forty-two names, all referring to names in the source text (of which there are sixty-five), where half have been rendered into French and half transliterated. The end result is a compromise: thanks to the footnotes, the reader will be aware of Benedikt's classification, although the lists will mean little or nothing. A great deal has been lost, but arguably the effect is not as incongruous as the English version containing one hundred names, none of which were Russian.

The final section of this chapter looks in some detail at one longer section of the book (a complete chapter chosen for its richness of unusual word forms in the original Russian) to examine how the translations cope. The source text consists of an extended passage of conversation incorporating humour and profane language.

5.3.5. An Example of Dialogue: Chapter 26, *Черв*

This section looks at the translations of Chapter 26 'Cherv': this comes towards the end of the book, after Benedikt's marriage which has raised him to Murza status. He has gone to visit his former friend Nikita Ivanovich (mentioned in the above examples) who is entertaining another survivor of the Explosion, Lev L'vovich; both of the old men have been drinking. Benedikt has travelled on a sleigh pulled by a mutant slave who runs on all fours: the mutant, who also was alive before the explosion, is left outside in the cold but towards the end of the chapter he is invited in by the old men and gets drunk. It turns out that the mutant's opinions are deeply offensive to his two hosts.

Throughout the chapter, Benedikt's speech in the French translation is full of *mignons-language*. Soon after the beginning, the first joke comes when Lev L'vovich realises whom Benedikt has married. He says:

"I heard about it, I heard about your mesalliance."
"Thank you," said Benedikt, feeling touched. So they had heard about his marriage. (E: 193)

- Ah oui, j'ai entendu parler de votre mésalliance.
- Grand merci, lança Benedikt, ému par le compliment. Ainsi donc, vous en avez ouï parler... (F : 289/90)

Gambrell has distorted 'misalliance', the word whose meaning Benedikt misinterprets. In French, *mésalliance* is a real word (meaning 'improper alliance'). Either Gambrell has decided to alter undistorted source language, or Glogowski has removed source distortion; arguably distortion adds nothing to the joke. In Russian:

- Слышал, слышал про ваш мезальянс.
- Спасибо, - поблагодарил Бенедикт. Даже растрогался. Слышали, значит. (R: 269)

Thus the Russian *мезальянс* borrows the French as a loan word and Benedikt misinterprets the word as complimentary. The introduction of a distorted word in the English translation is an invention by Gambrell.

The next clanger from Benedikt follows a complaint by Nikita Ivanovich that a statue of Pushkin is being used by the townsfolk for hanging out their washing. Benedikt objects:

"But Nikita Ivanich, you were the one who always said the people's path to him should never be overgrown. And now you're complaining."
"Oh, Lord ... Benya ... That was a figure of speech."
"All right, we can put that figure wherever you want. I'll send some serfs. We could use the sleigh too." (E: 194)

- Mais, Nikita Ivanytch, vous vouliez vous-même qu'oncques ne soit envahi de ronces le sentier par où le peuple s'achemine à icelui monument ! Et voilà que vous vous plaignez.
- Ah, mon Dieu, Benia... Il s'agit d'une métaphore, d'un transfert de sens.
- D'un transfert? À votre guise. Nous allons le transférer où vous voudrez. Je vais amener des serfs, on pourra aussi se servir d'un traîneau. (F: 290/1)

Both translations convey the same basic joke. In English, Benedikt misinterprets 'figure' in 'figure of speech' to mean the statue and promises to move it. In French, Nikita Ivanovich explains that a metaphor is a *transfert de sens* (transfer of meaning) and Benedikt picks on the word *transfert* and assumes it is to apply to the statue. In Russian:

> *- Да вы ж сами хотели, чтоб народная тропа не зарастала, Никита Иваныч! А теперь жалуетесь.*
> *- Ах, Боже мой, Беня... Ну это же в переносном смысле.*
> *-Пожалуйста, перенесем куда скажете. Холопов пригоню. На санях тоже можно.* (R: 270)

Here the French translation closely mirrors the Russian, while the English version retains the same basic joke and works well.

There follows a dicussion between the old men about topics familiar to an American/French readership (e.g. photocopiers, fax machines, The International Court in The Hague) before the following exchange:

> *"Samizdat is what we need."*
> *"But Lev Lvovich! We have lots of samizdat, it's flourishing."*
> (E: 195)

> *- Le samizdat est indispensable.*
> *- Allons donc, Lev Lvovitch ! Le samizdat, de toute façon, prospère chez nous comme la plus luxuriante des plantes.* (F: 293)

Neither translator explains 'samizdat': the word (referring to the distribution of underground literature in the former USSR) does appear in non-specialist French dictionaries (e.g. Le Robert) but is relatively rare in English. In Russian:

> *- Самиздат нужен.*
> *- Но Лев Львович! Но самиздат у нас и так цветет пышным цветом*. (R: 272)

To the Russian reader it is obvious that the reference to 'samizdat', ie 'self-publishing' is an ironic comment on the copying out of the literature of former times. This would probably not register with many readers of the translations.

Following a mention of spiritual life, Benedikt interrupts:

> *"My life is spiritual."*

"In what sense?"
"I don't eat mice."
"Well, and what else?"
"Not a single bite ... Only [an extensive list of delicacies that he does eat] (E: 195/6)

- Moi, je mène une vie spirituelle, […]
- C'est-à-dire ?
- Je ne mange point de souris
- Et alors ?
- Oncques ne mets icelles en bouche. Je ne me repais que [similar list] (F: 293)

It is not immediately clear why Benedikt has misunderstood spiritual life as referring to his diet, specifically to not eating mice. In French, *spirituelle* also means humorous, but the connection with food remains obscure. In Russian:

- У меня жизнь духовная, - кашлянув, вмешался Бенедикт.
- В каком смысле?
- Мышей не ем. - Ну, и?. .
- В рот не беру. Только птицу. Мясо […] (R: 272)

It would appear that Benedikt assumes spirituality is associated with luxury, and to him his list of exotic food items demonstrates that this is exactly the life he leads: in other words, spirituality is not about 'not eating mice', but rather about the alternative diet. To the English speaker the reference to mice confuses, but this is not brought about by a literal translation.

As Benedikt talks of his mother-in-law, he misinterprets another insult as a compliment:

"...Fevronia, my mother-in-law, doesn't let us smoke at the table."
"I remember Pigronia," remarked Lev Lvovich. "I remember her father. An imbecile. And her grandfather. Another imbecile. Her great-grandfather too."
"That's right," affirmed Benedikt. "She's from one of the oldest families, of French origin." (E: 196)

- Fevronia, ma belle-mère, ne le permet point à table.

- Je me souviens de Fevronia, fit remarquer Lev Lvovitch. Et je me souviens de son père : un débile. D'ailleurs, son grand-père était tout aussi débile. De même que l'arrière-grand-père.

- Parfaitement exact, confirma Benedikt. Une lignée française, des plus anciennes. (F: 293/4)

The only substantial difference between the translations is that the second mention of 'Fevronia' is distorted to 'Pigronia' in English but left unaltered in French, in the same manner as the previous 'misalliance' example. In Russian:

Теща моя, Феврония, за столом не велит.

- Помню Хавронью, - заметил Лев Львович. - Папашу ее помню. Дебил. Дедушку. Тоже был дебил. Прадедушка - тоже.

- Совершенно верно, - подтвердил Бенедикт. - Стариннейшего роду, из французов. (R: 273)

In Russian Lev L'vovich uses the colloquial Russian word *хавронья* for 'sow' to refer contemptuously to Benedikt's mother-in-law's name *Феврония*, the two words differing in the first two letters only. Therefore in this instance the English translation is faithful to the original and provides an analogy with Fevronia's excessive eating habits.

Benedikt now discloses the real purpose of his visit: he wants Nikita Ivanovich to give him some old books (possession of which by all but the Murzas is illegal), and to that end he has brought as a present one of his favourites - it turns out to be a collection of nursery rhymes, much to the derision of the old men. They refuse to co-operate, fearing a trap. Benedikt offers a swap arrangement:

"... I have good books, they don't have any Illness or anything..."

"Interlibrary with Leviathan. I wouldn't get involved." (E: 197)

- ... Ce sont bons livres que j'ai, on n'attrape point Maladie à les lire, nul danger…

- Se jeter dans la gueule du loup, très peu pour moi ! déclara Lev Lvovitch. (F: 296)

Interlibrary is a well-known arrangement enabling libraries to borrow books from each other. A translation of the French is: "To throw oneself into the wolf's

mouth, it makes very little sense to me!" A further difference between the translations is (Gambrell) 'the books do not have any Illness' (as proper noun, with initial capital) and (Glogowski) 'reading the books will not give you an illness'. In Russian:

> *У меня книги хорошие, ни Болезни от них, ничего...*
> *- Межбиб с Левиафаном, - сказал Лев Львович. - Я бы не связывался.* (R: 275)

In Russian, the text reads as 'you won't get any disease from them', harking back to the penalty for reading forbidden books in Fedor Kuz'mich. Possibly the English translation prefers 'the books do not have any Illness' in order to supply a rather laboured tie-in with Lev L'vovich's subsequent comments on Benedikt, where the initial letters of 'Interlibrary and Leviathan' coincide with those in the word 'Illness'. The Russian text uses the Interlibrary reference; in this instance the French translation has substituted a different expression. As the 'Interlibrary with Leviathan', or Satan,[3] reference is clearly pointing out the dangers of 'supping with the Devil', the French translation explicitates and thus makes this clearer.

Benedikt, however, tempts the old men, saying one of his books is about freedom:

> *"The author, who's the author?"*
> *Benedikt thought.*
> *"I can't remember right off. I think it starts with Pl."*
> *"Plekhanov?"*
> *'No ..."*
> *"It couldn't be Plevier?"*
> *"No, no ... Don't interrupt ... Aha! It's* Plaiting and Knitting Jackets*. 'When knitting the armhole we cast on two extra loops for freedom of movement…'"* (E: 198)

> *- L'auteur, qui est l'auteur ?*
> *Benedikt se pourpensa.*
> *- Je ne me le remets point d'emblée... Ce me semble qu'il commence par « Tr… »*
> *- Trotski ?*
> *- Non.*
> *- Quand même pas Trifonov ?*

[3] See Isaiah, Chpt 27, (i), 'In that day the LORD with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent;'

- Non, non... Vous me faites perdre le fil... Ah oui ! « Tricotage ». J'y suis : Tricotage de camisoles pour femmes. Afin d'avoir plus de liberté de mouvement…. (F: 296)

The translators use different letters for the authors' names to link in with the name of Benedikt's book. The English translation does not name Benedikt's author, only the title of the book, whereas the French translation gives the author's name as *Tricotage* (Knitting) followed by the book's 'title' *Tricotage de camisoles pour femmes* (Knitting jackets for ladies). In Russian:

- Сразу не вспомню... На "Пле" как-то...
- Плеханов?
- Не...
- Неужто Плеве?
- Не, не... Не сбивайте... А! - "Плетення". Да! "Плетення жинкових жакетов". (R: 276)

In Russian the author is named, as in the French version, as the first word of the book's title: 'Pletennia', standing for '*Weaving*' as in 'Weaving Inca Jackets'.

Getting nowhere, Benedikt goes outside to check on the mutant: the old men insist on Benedikt bringing him into the warmth. After a few drinks the mutant is in full flow:

"...there was figure skating on the tube. Irina Rodnina! A double lux ... Maya Kristalinskaya was singing. She gets on your nerves, doesn't she?"
"I..." objected Lev Lvovich.
"I, I, I, it's always I. 'I' is just a letter of the alphabet! Gone to seed under Kuzmich, Glorybe! He's let everyone go to pot, frigging dwarf!" (E: 200)

- À la téloche, patinage artistique, Irina Rodina ! Double toe-loop... Chansons de Maya Kristalinskaïa... Tiens, on dirait que tu ne l'appréciais pas, toi ?
- Je..., protesta Lev Lvovitch.
- Je, je ! Rien que du « je » ! Il vous a laissé la bride sur le cou, Fiodor Kouzmitch, gloire à lui ! Il vous a pourris, ce nain enfoiré ! (F: 299)

'Tube' and *téloche* are both slang words for television. In Gambrell's translation the comment on Kristalinskaya's singing reads as a general complaint shared by the

speaker, whereas the French text makes it specific to the listener Lev L'vovich ("Here, you don't think she's any good, do you?). Lev L'vovich's objection is cut short after the word 'I' (*je* in French), and as the French word has two letters any reference to a letter of the alphabet would be obscure and is omitted. In addition, there is a distortion of the figure-skater's name, from 'Rodnina' to 'Rodina', perhaps indicating slurred speech. The remainder of the French text can be translated as "F.K. has left you unchecked. He's let you go to rot, the shitty little dwarf." In Russian:

> *- ... по ящику фигурное катание Ирина Роднина! Двойной тулуп... Майя Кристалинская поет. Тебе мешала, да?*
>
> *- Я... - возражал Лев Львович.*
>
> *- Я, я! Все "я"! "Я" - последняя буква алфавита! Распустились при Кузьмиче, слава ему! Всех распустил, карла гребаный!* (R: 278)

The television is referred to using *ящику* or 'box'. In Russian the mutant scolds Lev L'vovich for his use of the pronoun 'I', saying that this is symptomatic of Fedor Kuz'mich's lax regime – underlined by the use of the word *Распустились* – 'got too much freedom'. There is a perceived link to the Russian saying '*Я* (Iat) is the last letter of the Russian alphabet', used as a put-down for excessive use of the word 'I'. Neither translation catches this allusion.

Shortly afterwards the mutant commences an extended rant which, as it introduces many difficulties for the translator, is examined in some detail. The mutant slurs his words on occasion. The English translation runs as follows (the bracketed omissions are interjections by the old men, cut short by the mutant):

> *". . . A co-op apartment in Skabl ... in Sviblovo," he said, tripping over his own tongue, "five minutes from the metro. A park zone, you got me? We weren't a bunch of rabinoviches living in the center! ... They were right to put you all in jail! [...] They stick a pair of glasses on and then they start thinking! ... I won't let you weeds hit me with a wrench. Don't you shake your beard at meeee! Abraham! You're an abraham! The government gives you a quota and you're supposed to stay within it ... Jeezus F ... Christ ... and not go wagging your butts in front of a bunch of foreigners ...[...] Gone and multiplied like rabbits, shit! Supposed to be two percent and not a cent more so you don't*

> *crush the working class! ... Who ate all the meat? Epstein! Huh? Who bought up all the sugar ... and we're supposed to make hooch from tomato paste, right? Isn't that right? You're a hitler! There's no Zhirinovsky for you guys anymore! […] Made your son a nice liddle blue shoot, suit, a hunnert percent wool! Then you made a deal to sell the Kuriles to Reagan! ... Not an inch will we yield! . . .[…] I said not one inch! ... We won't give up the Kuriles ... And you can stick your pillars up your rear end! You parasites, tried to turn the country into a museum. Pour gasoline over you and-just one little match! ... and your ppppparliament, and your books, and your academic Ssssssakharov! And. . ."* (E: 201)

Glogowski's French translation is reproduced in the Appendix at the end of this chapter (F: 300/1). It starts off in similar vein before inserting a footnote alongside the word 'Rabinovich,' pointing out that this is a typically Jewish name, leading the reader to understand, when reading the following sentences, that this is an anti-Jewish outburst. It is arguable that if one looks hard enough at the English translation then this text can be read in the same way: equally it is possible to miss the anti-Jewish connotations amongst the apparently disjointed ramblings. Although neither 'Rabinovich', 'Abraham' nor 'Epstein' are clear-cut synonyms for 'Jew' in English, Gambrell skirts the issue perhaps in deference to American sensitivities, whereas Glogowski has taken the view that without a footnote the true nature of the text could be missed.

Gambrell's translation continues with 'They were right to put you all in jail' whereas in French, following the footnote confirming the Jewish link, use of the vulgar slang word *foutre* is much more unpleasant and coarse than the English 'put': 'They were right to [*expletive*] slam you all in jail'. The innocuous enough sentence 'I won't let you weeds hit me with a wrench' (Gambrell) is interpreted quite differently in the French translation: referring to his (Jewish) adversaries as 'accursed scum', the mutant says they deserve nothing more than a blow on the head with a wrench.

The next few sentences refer to quotas, more specifically in the French where the mutant comes out with the Latin expression *numerus clausus*: a term referring

to controls on the number of Jewish students permitted to enter University in Imperialist Russia. Both translations subsequently quote a two per cent limit without further explanation. The expletives used are somewhat different in derivation: 'Jeezus F… Christ' (Gambrell) is modern North-American, coarse but sanitised through use of an abbreviation, *Putain de ta mère* (Glogowski) is a highly offensive obscenity linking the listener's mother to a prostitute. Whereas Gambrell again uses North-American vernacular in 'wagging your butts in front of a bunch of foreigners', Glogowski uses *fricoter* which means wheeler-dealing or, figuratively speaking, to 'get into bed with someone'. The references to 'sugar', 'hooch' and 'tomato paste' (Gambrell) are subject to a footnote in the French translation, explaining the importance of sugar in the manufacture of *samogone* (illicit liquor).

This anti-Jewish attack culminates in Gambrell's 'There's no Zhirinovsky for you guys anymore!' and the more explicit French version 'It would take a Zhirinovsky to control your numbers'. Neither translator explains who Zhirinovsky is, although their readers may well have seen the reports of some of his outbursts that have been widely carried in Western media. There follow references to an item of blue clothing for a boy, and a deal with President Reagan over the Kurile Islands, both of which are probably obscure to the respective target audiences. Again, neither translator seeks to offer an explanation. Whereas it is possible for an interested party to look up a reference for the Kuriles, such a recourse is not readily available for the blue garment. In English, a nice little blue suit is made for 'your son' while in French the speaker sweated blood to pay for the blue suit of pure wool for *mon gamin* or 'my little boy'. The English distorts 'little' as 'liddle', 'suit' as 'shoot' and 'hundred' as 'hunnert' while the French introduces a stammer in *p-p-payer*.

The insult 'And you can stick your pillars up your rear end!' (Gambrell) reads oddly. The French text is *Quant à tes poteaux, tu peux te les mettre dans le cul !* (Glogowski), where *poteaux* can mean pillars or, more usually, signposts, although it can also refer to good friends. Either of the two latter meanings make sense in this context (Nikita Ivanovich has been erecting signposts with the original street names all around the town). *Cul* can mean a vulgar expression for anus, so the

sentence reads ‘As for your signposts/mates, you can stick them up your arse’. Both texts contain an unexplained reference to a museum: ‘tried to turn the country into a museum’ (Gambrell), ‘set us up in a museum in the country’ (Glogowski) (this could refer to the signposts) before the final joke (if it can be called that), in that the old men listen through this highly offensive diatribe, making only half-hearted interventions ignored by the mutant, but are spurred into action by the (very slurred) mention of Sakharov, described as ‘academic’ (Gambrell) and as *académicien*, that is a ‘member of an Academy’(Glogowski).

Looking at the translations in their own right, they read as a collection of comments, some coarse, some offensive, with occasional continuity and various levels of obscurity. The American translator has left her readers to make of it what they will whereas Glogowski has two footnotes. Differences in meanings between the translations introduce questions of adequacy of translation (hitting with the wrench and the pillars/signposts). The French translation is much more vulgar in its use of the language attributed to a drunken slob (although it does attribute him with a knowledge of a Latin phrase) and is blatant in acknowledging that certain views are anti-semitic, making them offensive as well as politically incorrect for the Western reader.

The Russian source is also reproduced in the Appendix at the end of this chapter (R: 279/80). In this, the mutant begins by slurring the name of the Moscow suburb *Свиблове* using *Скообл...* (for no obvious reason) and then introduces the term ‘Rabinovich’ in a manner using synecdoche to describe the Jewish people as a whole – ‘Rabinovich’ being a common Jewish surname in Russia (‘son of the Rabbi’). It must be assumed that at this point the mutant is addressing Lev L’vovich (Nikita Ivanovich is not a Jewish name); he uses the word *сажали* for the placing in prison (which has connotations of ‘putting in a ghetto’) and *крапивное семя* as an insult, for which the French translation ‘accursed scum’ is literally accurate. However the expression is also Civil Service slang for ‘pen-pushers’ and this makes sense in this context. Another meaning of *крапивное* is ‘nettles’, presumably the source of the Gambrell’s use of ‘weeds’. The next expression *Вдарить монтировкой* is the source of disparity between the two translations:

Вдарить has been invented and implies 'should be hit on the head', the Russian being non-specific as to who does the hitting and both translations introducing explicitation.

The initial reference to quotas is simply through *процент* (per cent) rather than the *numerus clausus* introduced by Glogowski. However, the swear word *е-мое*, a combination of 'mother' and an obscenity, is closely related to the French version. The reference to foreigners uses the expression *иностранцами хвостом вертеть* or 'to set your tail at' and the two percent limit is introduced *чтоб у трудового народа на шее не засиживался!* - a command to prevent the Jewish people 'sponging off the workers'. Gambrell's translation, interestingly, presents this as an attempt by the Jewish people to 'crush the working class!' – rather more dramatic than the Russian original. After issuing this tirade, decrying the Jewish people using *Расплодились* 'they've just gone on breeding and breeding', the mutant rails against Jews clearing the shelves of sugar, the necessary ingredient for distilling *белое*, literally 'white stuff' hence spirits, giving rise to the derisive comment about using red tomato paste. The colour implication features in neither translation.

The reference to Zhirinovsky- *Жириновского на тебя нет*, 'no Zhirinovsky for you' without any mention of controlling numbers - shows that the French introduces explicitation. The blue suit is introduced as *сыну костюмчик васильковый чистсшщч... чистошерстяной,* 'for the son a little suit, cornflower blue, pure wool' with no details of whose son and no mention of sweating blood; both translators have accredited ownership of the son, differently as it turns out, and again the French includes extra information not in the source text. In the Russian original, the drunk speaker struggles over the word for pure wool.

The instruction as to what can be done with the pillars/posts uses *столбы*, which can mean either pillars or signposts, combined with a coarse vulgarity, implying that Gambrell's translation is both obscure in preferring 'pillars' and demure in its use of 'rear end'. The museum reference implies government or State rather than country, 'you've turned the State into a museum piece', and Sakharov is called an 'academician' rather than an 'academic', in this instance pointing to the French translation being the more exact.

It would appear that the French translation has better caught the spirit of the source text, albeit at the cost of introducing explicitation in the form of footnotes and original material. The English translation seems reluctant to acknowledge that this is the obnoxious ranting of a highly unpleasant drunken bigot with a foul mouth, and that the text sets out to be provocative and offensive; the reader is inclined to ask whether political correctness plays a part in the translation. What one would also want to consider is whether the reader of either translation would appreciate that the issues raised have wider reverberations within modern-day Russia. A Russian reader of the source text would probably see more of what is behind this passage, as in the following surmise.

It would appear that the references to the blue suit and the Kurile Islands are an attack on Boris Elts'in (Yeltsin), who controversially sent his son to Millfield School (an expensive public school in Somerset with a uniform consisting in part of a blue woollen jumper) and was inclined to negotiate over the Kuriles (although not with Reagan who had left office by that time). The Kurile Islands were either liberated or grabbed, depending on one's point of view, by the Soviet Union from Japan at the end of World War 2 and remain in Russian hands, a source of continuing unease between the two countries. Elts'in's feelers towards the Japanese had to be withdrawn after the success of Zhirinovsky in the 1993 elections. There is a link between the Kuriles, Zhirinovsky and some of the language used by the mutant. During a tour of the Russian Far East, Zhirinovsky addressed a rally in Sakhalin on 28 July 1994. Shaking his fist at a Japanese camera crew, Zhirinovsky shouted: 'If you take our islands, we will take your islands. A peace treaty has not been signed yet; we are in a state of war with you. Yet Russia has never threatened anybody - never captured even one piece of foreign land. If you do not have enough territory, do not propagate. But they propagate like rabbits. And now they demand the return of their land. You will never get anything! Go to hell, all of you!' (Pala, 1994). Zhirinovsky has also been outspoken in his attacks on the Jewish population in Russia, and it would appear that the ludicrous offensiveness of the source text is a send up of Zhirinovsky. Sanitising the text in translation removes the raison d'être for the passage and leaves a largely indecipherable list of comments with no obvious merit, but without considerable help from the translator,

it is unlikely the Western reader could be expected to appreciate the deeper significance to this passage, however translated.

Returning to the text, there is still time for Benedikt (now in the role of narrator) to betray his stupidity:

> *"Now you've done it, you s.o.b.!" A crimson Lev Lvovich suddenly hauled back and punched him. "Don't you dare touch Andrei Dmitrich!!!"*
> *There wasn't any Andrei Dmitrich in the izba…* (E: 201)

> *- Ah, tiens ! Voilà pour toi, canaille! cria soudain un Lvovitch cramoisi, frappant à tour de bras. Ne touche à Andreï Dmitritch[1] !!!*
> *Or y avait nul Andreï Dmitritch dans l'isba…*
>
> *1. Andreï Dmitirievitch Sakharov (Dmitritch est une forme familière de Dmitrievitch).* (N.d.T) (F: 301)

Glogowski uses a word meaning 'blackguard' (*canaille*) for 's.o.b' and inserts a footnote to make sure his readers understand that 'Andreï Dmitritch' is Sakharov. In both translations the joke centres on Benedikt's misunderstanding of 'touch'. In Russian:

> *- А вот тебе, скотина! - вдруг ударил наотмашь багровый Лев Львович. - Не трогай Андрей Дмитрича!!!*
> *Никакого Андрей Дмитрича в избе не было…* (R: 280)

Here, Benedikt doesn't understand that the verb *трогай* 'to touch' can have a figurative sense as well as a physical sense. Again this perhaps underlines the damage done to society after the Explosion. It is interesting that the same play on the meaning of the word touch works in all three languages.

The mutant is assailed and yells that it is Russians that are being hit. Thrown out into the snow, he can be heard shouting:

> "*I had a chrome faucet in Sviblovo! […] And you can't even get it up, you queers!"* (E: 202)

> *- A Sviblov, j'avais un vélo avec des pédales chromées ! Alors que, pour vous, ce serait pitié de gâcher du chrome, ban de pédales ! …* (F: 302)

The French translator has made use of the double meaning of *pédales*, either pedals (on a bike) or a crude word for homosexuals with a liking for younger boys (similar to paedos for paedophiles in English) to try to make sense of what is in Gambrell's translation a curious conjunction of sentences: 'In *Sviblovo* I had a bike with chrome *pédales.* Back then it would have been a pity to waste chrome on *pédales* like you lot.' In Russian:

> *- ...в Свиблове смеситель хромированный стоял! - неслось из метели. - А у вас ничего на хер не стоит, у пидарасов!... (R: 281)*

The source text revolves around the play between the phrase ***хро****мированный* ***сто****ял*, 'I had a chrome mixer tap' (signifying a luxury item) and ***хер*** *не* ***сто****ит* based on the obscenity *хер* - 'you have fuck all worth anything' - using the device of chiasmus to suggest the very opposite status. The translations are perhaps less vulgar, although the French has attempted to capture the sentiment of the Russian original.

5.4. Conclusion

It is clear that the two translations are working to different guidelines. The French target text has deliberately set out to emulate the language of the source text, this prompting an explanation from the translator to his readership (although Tolstaya provides no such luxury to readers of the source text). Glogowski has continued to provide information by way of footnotes throughout the novel. From the limited number of examples given in this chapter, it is also apparent that he will explicitate the text if he considers it appropriate. The result is probably a more demanding read than the English text, but foreignisation is not meant to make life easy. Whether the text is a more satisfying read is a matter of taste. However the problem is that, despite Glogowski's bold approach, there is still much that goes unexplained, leaving the reader puzzled as to passages that appear to have been included for no obvious reason, humour that seems to be forced and references without footnotes that do not resonate at all. Glogowski's translation could be interpreted as a half way house: for him to go any further would render the novel a mass of footnotes that might appeal to the Russian Studies academic but would turn

off the general reader who can only tolerate so many interruptions getting in the way of the plot. Gambrell, on the other hand, is working to no interruptions. Both translators frequently succeed in translating the humour: the danger is that the obscurities blot out the brilliancies.

Appendix: A 3-way Parallel Corpus

The English and French translations and the Russian source text for the mutant's diatribe are presented alongside as a 3-way parallel corpus:

". . . A co-op apartment in Skabl ... in Sviblovo," he said, tripping over his own tongue, "five minutes from the metro.	*- J'avais une belle piaule dans une coopérative de logement à Skoobl... j' veux dire à Sviblov, dit-il, la langue pâteuse. À cinq minutes du métro. Une zone verte, pigé ? Nous n'étions pas des Rabinovitch[2], nous autres, pour habiter dans le centre-ville... Et puis, ils avaient bien raison de vous foutre tous en taule ! […]*	*- ... кооператив в Скообл... в Свиблове, - заплетался языком Тетеря, - от метро пять минут.*
A park zone, you got me? We weren't a bunch of rabinoviches living in the center! ... They were right to put you all in jail! […]	*Ça chausse des lunettes et ça prétend juger de tout ! Je ne vous laisserai pas faire... maudite engeance !... Un coup de clé à molette sur la tronche, voilà tout ce que ça mérite !... Ramène pas ta barbiche, Abraham !*	*Район зеленый, понял? Мы не рабиновичи, чтоб в центре жить!.. И правильно вас всех сажали! […]*
They stick a pair of glasses on and then they start thinking! ... I won't let you weeds hit me with a wrench. Don't you shake your beard at meeee! Abraham! You're an abraham!	*L'État t'a fixé un numerus clausus, respecte-le ! ...*	*- ...очки напялят и расуждать! Не позволю... крапивное семя! Вдарить монтировкой... Не тряси бородо-о-ой! Абрам! Ты абрам!*
The government gives you a quota and you're supposed to stay within it ... Jeezus F ... Christ ... and not go wagging your butts in front of a bunch of foreigners . .[...]	*Putain de ta mère !... Au lieu de fricoter avec les étrangers ...[…]*	*Тебе от государства процент положен, и соблюдай!.. е-мое... а не с иностранцами хвостом вертеть... […]*
Gone and multiplied like rabbits, shit! Supposed to be two percent and not a cent more so you don't crush the working class! ... Who ate all the meat? Epstein! Huh?	*Ils ont proliféré, putain ! Alors qu'on vous a ordonné de pas dépasser les deux pour cent !... pour que vous viviez pas aux crochets du peuple travailleur ! ... Qui est-ce qui a bouffé toute la viande ? Epstein, pardi !*	*- Расплодились, бля! Два процента вам быть велено!.. чтоб у трудового народа на шее не засиживался!.. Кто все мясо съел? Эпштейн! А?!*
Who bought up all the sugar ... and we're supposed to make hooch from tomato paste, right? Isn't that right?	*Vous avez raflé tout le sucre[3] sur le marché, et nous autres, fallait qu'on se rabatte sur le concentré de tomates pour fabriquer la gnôle, hein ?!*	*Сахар скупили, а мы белое из томат-пасты гони, да? Так?..*
You're a hitler!	*Espèce d'Hitler !*	*Гитлер ты!*
There's no	*Faudrait un Jirinovski pour te régler ton compte !*	*Жириновского на*

Zhirinovsky for you guys anymore! […] *Made your son a nice liddle blue shoot, suit, a hunnert percent wool! Then you made a deal to sell the Kuriles to Reagan! ... Not an inch will we yield! . . .[...]* *I said not one inch! ... We won't give up the Kuriles ... And you can stick your pillars up your rear end! You parasites, tried to turn the country into a museum. Pour gasoline over you and-just one little match! ... and your ppppparliament, and your books, and your academic Ssssssakharov! And. . .”*	*[...]* *Moi, je sue sang et eau pour p-p-payer à mon gamin un costume de laine vierge couleur bleuet ! Et toi, pendant ce temps, tu complotes pour vendre les îles Kouriles à Reagan !... Vous n'en aurez pas un pouce !... […]* *J'ai dit : pas un pouce !... Vous n'aurez pas les Kouriles !... Quant à tes poteaux, tu peux te les mettre dans le cul ! Voilà qu'ils nous installent un musée dans le pays, ces parasites ! Faudrait vous arroser tous avec de l'essence, et craquer une allumette ! et votre p-p-parlement, et vos bouquins, et votre académicien Sakharov ! Et...* *2. Nom typiquement juif. (N.d.T)* *3. En Russie, le sucre est utilisé pour la distillation de samogone, tord-boyaux de fabrication artisanale et clandestine. (N.d.T)*	*тебя нет! […]* *- ...сыну костюмчик васильковый чистсшщч... чистошерстяной!.. А ты сговорился Курилы Рейгану продать!.. Ни пяди!.. […]* *- Сказал: ни пяди!.. Курилы не отдадим... А столбы свои в задницу себе засунь! Развели музей в государстве, паразиты! Бензином вас всех... и спичку!.. и пппппарламент ваш, и книжки, и академика Сссссахарова! И...*

Conclusion

This thesis sets out to examine the novel *Кысь* by Tatyana Tolstaya (2000) against the backdrop of Russian literary postmodernist writing.

A short overview of the emergence of Russian postmodernist prose is offered and perceived differences between Russian postmodernist theory and Western postmodernist theory outlined. The role of the dystopian novel in postmodernist writing is examined and the themes of self-referentiality and self-reflexiveness explored with reference to the role of Socialist Realism within Russian history and the re-action to its strictures in the stylistics of Russian postmodern prose. In particular, themes of memory, evoked by the motifs and language of folklore, are explored. The theme of 'language' as the 'dominant' or controlling device is identified and developed as the main postmodernist stylistic strategy in the novel.

In order to evaluate the translation of the novel a review of translation theory is also offered, including an overview of the potential for the use of corpora in translation studies. A detailed corpus of 'non-normative' language in the novel was produced using WordSmith software and a sample analysed to examine the English translation. I argue that the novel, with its inherent heteroglossia and archaic language, firmly set within a Russian context, does not lend itself to either a straightforward foreignising or domesticating treatment in translation. I have contrasted two approaches in translation – the first in French by Christophe Glogowski, making ample use of paratext, and the second in English, produced by the American translator Jamey Gambrell, with minimal paratext.

In sum, I would like to suggest that the translations of unfamiliar (to a Western audience) Russian tales by the author Arthur Ransome, in such a way as to make them accessible to those without the background knowledge of Russian culture, could provide a model for a translation of *Кысь*, specifically the idea of introducing a third 'setter' to the novel, someone to perform the

role of third narrator. This could be a suitable translation strategy with which to preserve the charm and complexity of the original postmodernist text.

For example, the paragraph examined in detail in Chapter 5 could be rendered in the following style:

> Terenty is really into his stride. The drink has loosened his tongue so much he is tripping over it. The more he gets going, the more he reminds you of someone from the past …
>
> 'I had a co-op apartment in Skabl ... in Sviblovo,' he can hardly say it properly, 'five minutes from the metro.'
>
> True enough, the Moscow metro did have a huge station there, it was away from the middle of town.
>
> 'Parks everywhere round there, you got me? We weren't like those Jews the Rabinoviches living in the centre!'
>
> And he looks straight at Lev L'vovich as he says this.
>
> 'They were right to slam you all in that ghetto. They stick a pair of glasses on and then they start thinking! Pen pushers! ... Should be hit on the head with a wrench!'
>
> This is incoherent rubbish but Lev L'vovich is getting quite agitated.
>
> 'Don't you shake your beard at meeee! Abraham! You're an Abraham! The government gives you a quota and you're supposed to stay within it'.
>
> So now he's got on to birth control.
>
> 'Your mother's just a whore and you're climbing into bed with a bunch of foreigners. Just gone on breeding and breeding. Supposed to be two per cent and no more to stop you sponging off the workers! Who ate all the meat? Epstein!'
>
> He's got quite a store of Jewish names.
>
> 'Huh? Who bought up all the sugar?'
>
> What's the problem now?
>
> 'We go to make our moonshine, our white spirit, the sugar's gone and what's left? Tomato paste, right? Isn't that right? You're a Hitler! There's no Zhirinovsky for you guys anymore!'
>
> Zhirinovsky! He could talk like this when he was wound up!
>
> 'The son got a little outfit, cornflower blue, p-p-pure wool'
>
> This is straight Zhirinovsky talk, ranting at Yeltsin for sending his boy to that expensive English school. What else can he remember?
>
> 'Then you made a deal to sell the Kuriles to Reagan!'
>
> That old chestnut, everyone knows the Japanese wanted the islands back.

> ‘Not an inch will we yield! I said not one inch! ... We won't give up the Kuriles’
>
> He’s turning to Nikita Ivanovich now …
>
> ‘You can stick your signposts up your arse! You parasites, tried to turn the country into a museum. Pour gasoline over you and - just one little match! ... and your ppppparliament, and your books, and your academician Ssssssakharov! And…’
>
> The old men are going mad. They’re laying into him. Doesn’t that just sum up the so-called intelligentsia of this country. They’re the reason we’re in a mess. The only time they show any initiative is to run to protect the reputation of one of their own.
>
> ‘You blackguard!’ screams Lev L’vovich, bright red in the face. ‘Don’t you dare touch Andrei Dmitrich!’
>
> That’s Sakharov.
>
> *But there be no Andrei Dmitrich in the isba, though you sees double when you be drinking too much, them strange faces a-watching from the corner, then you be blinking and they be gone.*

The degree of explicitation required is a matter of judgement, but the potential for explaining the background without the necessity of breaking up the text with numerous footnotes has attractions.

In the broader view, questions must be asked as to whether it is indeed straightforward to discuss Russian contemporary culture in terms of postmodernist poetics, given that the Stalinist years have resulted in a hiatus generally suppressing the modernism to which we are hoping to examine a successor, in chronological terms. Smith (2004) makes the point that the influential art critic Boris Groys considers Western postmodernism to be a reaction to the defeat of modernism, yielding to commercial, market-driven, popular art. According to Groys this has resulted in the ‘poetics of quotation and ironic play’. For Groys, this striving equates with the wish for power.

Many scholars have attempted to discuss Tolstaya in the context of postmodern aesthetics, most prominently Helena Goscilo in relation to feminism, but it is important to stress that Tolstaya herself has rejected out of hand all such attempts. Nevertheless, we might surmise that Brian McHales’s categorisation of the

development between modernist and postmodernist practice may lead us to think in terms of *neomodernist* trends in contemporary culture.

In view of Tatyana Tolstaya's self-professed admiration of modernist authors, documented and offered in translation in this thesis, and her self-representation in interviews and essays, we as readers are challenged to re-assess her role in contemporary Russian culture, as a post-modernist author or otherwise.

Bibliography

Principal Texts

Tolstaya, T. (2000) *Кысь*, Moscow: Подкова. Online: <http://www.lib.ru/PROZA/TOLSTAYA/kys.txt > (accessed 17 January 2007).

—— (2002) *Le Slynx*, trans. C. Glogowski, Paris: Robert Laffont.

—— (2003a) *The Slynx*, trans. J. Gambrell, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Texts by Same Author

Tolstaya, N. and T. Tolstaya (2002) *Двое*, Moscow: Подкова.

Tolstaya, T. (1989) *On the Golden Porch*, trans. A. Bouis, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

—— (1992) *Sleepwalker in a Fog*, trans. J. Gambrell, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

—— (2001) *День*, Moscow: Подкова.

—— (2003b) *Pushkin's Children*: *Writings on Russia and Russians*, trans. J. Gambrell, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Russian-language Texts

Ageev, A. (2001) 'Голод 45' in *Русскиа журнал*, 2 August 2001.

Bakhtin, M, (1986) *Литературное-критические статьи Проблема речевых жанров*, Moscow: Художественная литература pp. 428-472.

Barta, P. (1990) 'The Author, the Cultural Tradition and Glasnost: An Interview with Tatanya Tolstaya, *Russian Language Journal* 147, 9: 265-283.

Ben'iash, E. (2001) Dunia's Sarafan, *Дружба народов*, 2

Bradbury, R. (1965) *451 Градус по фаренгейту*, trans. N. Gal' and T. Shinkar', Moscow: Молодая гвардия.

Cheslav (2001) 'Читая "Кысь" Татьяны Толстой', *Яхте*

Chukovskii, K. (1966) *Высокое искусствоб*, Moscow: Художественная литература

Danil'kin, L. (2000) 'на "Кысь" Татьяны Толстой', *Афиша*

Eliseev, N. (2000) Татьяна Толстая (роман) Кысь, *Новая русская книга*, 6.

Formanovskaia, N. (1989) *Речевой этикет и культура общения*, Moscow: Русский язык

Ivanova, N. (2001) 'И птицу Паулин изрубить на каклеты', *Знамя*, 3

Kabanova, O. (2000) 'Кысь, брысь, Русь' in *Известия*, 31 October 2000

Korolenko,P (2000) 'Кысь не читал, но горячо одобряю', *Slovo – Word, NY*

Kuritsyn, V. (2000) 'на "Кысь" Татьяны Толстой', *ВремяМН*

—— (2001) *Русский литературный постмодернизм*, Moscow: ОГИ.

Latynina, A. (2000) 'А вот вам ваш духовный ренессанс', *Литературная газета*, 47

Lipovetsky, M. (1997) 'Русскйи постмодернизм', *Ocherki istoricheskoi poetiki*

—— (2001) 'След Кыси', *Искусство кино* 2.

—— (2002) 'ПМС (постмодернизм сегодня)', *Znamya* 5.

Mal'gin, A. (1988) 'Татьяна Толстая: «Это было так легко – не учиться»', *Неделя* 21.

Maryniak, I. (1990) 'The human spirit is androgynous', *Index on Censorship* 9: 29-30.

Nefagina, G. (2002) 'Антиутопия в русской прозе конца xx века и роман Т. Толстой "Кысь"', *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 36: 183-200.

Nemzer, A. (2000) *Азбука как азбука*. Online: < http://www.ruthenia.ru/nemzer/kys.html> (accessed 17 January 2007).

Ol'shanskii, D. (2000) 'Что житие твое, пес смердящий?', *Семь дней* 18.

Paramonov, B. (2000) 'Русская история наконец оправдала себя в литературе', *ВремяМН*, 14 October 2000.

Rakhaeva, I. (2002) 'Игорь Виноградов: "у" аполлоновки" претензия быть литературным "оскаром"' in *Известия*, 23 January 2002.

Remizova, M. (2002) 'GRANDES DAMES прошедшего сезона', *Континент* 112.

Roll, S. (1996), *Постмодернсты о посткультнре: интервью с современными писателиами и критиками*, Moscow: Р. Елинин

Rubinstein, L. (2000) 'на "Кысь" Татьяны Толстой'in *Итоги*, 26 October 2000.

Slavnikova, O. (2001) ‘Пушкин с маленькой буквы’, *Новый мир*, 3.
Stepanian, K (2001) ‘на "Кысь" Татьяны Толстой’, *Знамя*, 3.
Trubinskii, V. (1984) *Очерки русского диалектного синтаксиса*, Leningrad: Издателство ленинградского университета.
Volodina, A. (2000) ‘Про букву "Ж", американца О'Нила, хищную Кысь и не только...’ in *Вести*, 14 October 2000.
Zemskaia, E. (1983) *Русская разговорная речь*, Moscow: Наука.
Zemskaia, E. and D. Shmelev (1984) *Городское просторечие*, Moscow: Наука.

Other Texts

Abramovich, A. (2003) ‘To Russia with Love’ in *Washington Post*, 2 February 2003.
Arrojo, R. (1998) ‘The Revision of the Traditional Gap between Theory and Practice & the Empowerment of Translation in Postmodern Times’, *The Translator* 4: 25-48.
Baker, M. (1995) ‘Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research’, *Target* 7: 223-43.
—— (1996) ‘Corpus-based translation studies: The challenges that lie ahead’ in *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering, in Honour of Juan C. Sager*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 175-86.
—— (2000a) ‘Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator’, *Target* 12: 241-266.
—— (2000b) ‘Linguistic perspectives on translation’, in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 20-26.
Banville, J. (2003) ‘Blastings’ in *New Republic*, 6 March 2003.
Barthelme, D. (1968) *Snow White*, New York: Bantam.
—— (1988) ‘An Interview with Donald Barthelme’ in T. Leclair and L. McCaffery (eds.) *Anything can Happen: Interviews with contemporary American novelists*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana.
Baudrillard, J. (1994) *Simulacra and Simulation, (The Body in Theory: Histories of Cultural Materialism)* trans. S. F. Glaser, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Bayley, J. (2003) ‘Haunted by the Russian Devil’ in *New York Review of Books*, 27 February 2003
Benjamin, W. (1923) ‘Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers’, preface to C. Baudelaire *Tableaux Parisiens*, trans. W. Benjamin, Heidelberg: Richard Weissbach.
Belyi, A. (1961) *St. Petersburg*, trans. J. Cournos, New York : Doubleday.
—— (1978) *Petersburg*, trans. R. Maguire and J. Malmstad, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
—— (1995) *Petersburg*, trans. D. McDuff, London: Penguin.
Berman, A. (1995) *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*, Paris: Gallimard.
Berry, E.E. and A. Miller-Pogacar (eds.) (1995) *Re-entering the Sign: Articulating New Russian Culture*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Blair, E. (2003) ‘After the Blast’ in *Newsday*, 12 January 2003.
Bosseaux, C. (2001) ‘A study of the translator’s voice and style in the French translations of Virginia Woolf’s *The Waves*’, *CTIS Occasional Papers* 1: 55-75.
Bratus, B. (1969) *The Formation and Expressive Use of Diminutives*, trans. D. Guild, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Briggs, A. (2000) ‘Translated Literature: Russian, Pushkin’, in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 583-586.
British National Corpus. Online. <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/> (accessed 17 January 2007).
Brown, E. (1963) *Russian Literature since the Revolution*, New York: Collier-Macmillan.
Buck, T. (1996) ‘Loyalty and Licence: Thomas Mann’s Fiction in English Translation’, *Modern Language Review* 91: 898-921.
Butler, C. (2002) *Postmodernism: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: OUP.

Carden, P. (1987) 'Utopia and Anti-Utopia: Aleksei Gastev and Evgeny Zamyatin', *Russian Review* 46, 1:1-18
Charbonneau, J. (2003) '"Slynx" reveals fascinating yet scary world' in *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, 12 January 2003.
Clowes, E. (1993) *Russian Experimental Fiction: Resisting Ideology after Utopia*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Comrie, B., G. Stone and M. Polinsky (1996) *The Russian Language in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Conrad, J. (1989) 'Russian Ritual Incantations: Tradition, Diversity, and Continuity', *SEEJ* 33, 3: 422-444.
Cornwell, N. (ed.) (1998) *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*, London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn
Costello, D.P. & I.P. Foote, (1967), *Russian Folk Literature*, Oxford : Clarendon.
Davies, I. (1990) 'An Interview with Tatanya Tolstaya', *Border Lines* 20/21:26-29
Davis, K. (2001) *Deconstruction and Translation*, Manchester: St Jerome.
Delabatista, D. (ed.) (1997) Introduction to *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*, Manchester: St Jerome.
Derrida, J. (1985) "Des Tours de Babel", trans. J.F. Graham, in J.F. Graham (ed.) *Difference in Translation*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
—— (1987) *Positions*, trans. A. Bass, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
—— (1992) *Acts of Literature*, ed. D. Attridge, New York and London: Routledge.
Dryden, J. (1956) *The Works of John Dryden*, eds. E. N. Hooker & H. T. Swedenberg, Jr., Berkeley: University of California Press.
Eder, R. (2003) 'Tatyana Tolstaya on Russian Past and Present' in *New York Times Book Review*, 26 January 2003.
Epstein, M., A. Genis and S. Vladiv-Glover (1999) *Russian Postmodernism: New Perspectives on Post-Soviet Culture*, New York, Oxford: Berghan Books.
Falchikov, M. (2000) 'Translated Literature: Russian, Twentieth-Century Fiction', in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 605-609.
Fawcett, P. (1995) 'Translation and power play', *The Translator* 1: 177-192.
von Flotow, L. (1997) *Translation and Gender*, Manchester UK, St Jerome.
France, P. (1995) 'From Russian Tale to English Children's Story: The Case for Arthur Ransom', *New Comparison* 20: 30-45.
—— (2000a) 'Translation studies and translation criticism', in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 3-10.
—— (2000b) 'Translated Literature: Russian, Dostoevsky', in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 594-598.
Frawley, W. (1984) *Translation: Literary, Linguistic & Philosophical Perspectives*, Newark: University of Delaware Press.
Genette, G. (1991) 'Introduction to the Paratext' trans. M. MacLean, *New Literary History* 22: 261-272.
Gessen, A. (2003) 'Tatania Tolstaya. *Kys''*. Online:<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~slavic/review/tolstaia.html> (accessed 17 January 2007)
Gofman V. (1985) 'Dal's Folkloric Skaz' in B. Eikhenbaum and Y. Tynyanov (eds.) *Russian Prose*, New York: Ardis.
Goscilo, H. (1996) *The Explosive World of Tatyana N. Tolstaya's Fiction*, Armonk, New York, London: M.E. Sharpe.
—— (1988) 'Tat'iana Tolstaia's 'Dome of Many-Coloured Glass': The World Refracted through Multiple Perspectives', *Slavic Review*, 47: 280-290.
Hassan, I. (1987) *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press
Herman, C. (2003) 'Finding the Beast within, and the Mice' in *Washington Times*, 12 January 2003

Hermans, T. (2000) 'Norms of translation', in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 10-15.
Hervey, S. and I. Higgins (1992) *Thinking French Translation*, London: Routledge.
Huxley, A. (1969) *Letters of Aldous Huxley*, ed. G. Smith, London: Chatto.
Inngs, J. (2003) 'From Harri to Garri: Strategies for the Transfer of Culture and Ideology in Russian Translations of Two English Fantasy Stories', *Meta*, 48: 285-297.
Jakobson, R. (1971) 'The Dominant' in L. Matejka and K. Pomorska (eds.) *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, London: MIT Press.
—— (1985) 'Sign and System of Language' in K. Pomorska and S. Rudy (eds.) *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Kakutani, M. (2003) 'A Surrealistic Journey from Fool to Murderer' in *New York Times*, 11 February 2003.
Kennedy, G. (1998) *An introduction to Corpus Linguistics*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Kenny, D. (2001) *Lexis and creativity in translation: A corpus-based study*, Manchester: St Jerome.
—— (2005) 'Parallel corpora and translation studies: old questions, new perspectives? Reporting *that* in Gepcolt: a case study', in G. Barnbrook, P. Danielsson and M. Mahlberg (eds.), *Meaningful Texts: The Extraction of Semantic Information from Monolingual and Multilingual Corpora*, London: Continuum, pp. 154-65.
Khrushcheva, N. (2003) 'Where Rabbits Fly' in *TLS*, 5 October 2001.
Kolesnikoff, N. (2001) 'Stylistic Innovations of Russian Postmodern Prose', *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review* 28, 1-2: 89-100.
Koskinen, K. (2000) *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*, Tampere: University of Tampere.
Laird, S. (1999) *Voices of Russian Literature: Interviews with Ten Contemporary Writers*, Oxford: OUP.
Leech, N. and M. Short (1981) *Style in Fiction: a Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, London: Longman.
Lambert, A. 'Tatyana Tolstaya' in *The Independent*, 31 May 1990.
Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York: Routledge.
Lewis, D. (1985) 'The Measure of Translation Effects' in J. F. Graham (ed.) *Difference in Translation*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 31-62.
Lipovetsky, M.(1999) *Russian Postmodernist Fiction: Dialogue with Chaos*, ed. E. Borenstein, Armonk and London: M.E. Sharpe
Littau, K. (1997) 'Translation in the Age of Postmodern Production: From Text to Intertext to Hypertext', *Forum for Modern Languages* 33(1): OUP.
Malmkjær, K. (2000) 'Translation and Mass Culture' in A. Chesterman (ed.) *Translation in Context*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 243-59.
de Man, P. (1986) 'Conclusions: Walter Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator"' in *The Resistance to Theory*, Machester: Manchester University Press, pp. 73-105.
Martynenko, O. (1987) 'Tatyana Tolstaya: A Little Man is a Normal Man', *Moscow News*, 8.
Matejka, L. and K. Pomorska (eds.) (1971), Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structural Views, Boston: The MIT Press.
Matthews, W. (1960) *Russian Historical Grammar*, London: Athlone Press.
May, R. (1994a) *The Translator in the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English*, Evanstown: Northwestern University Press.
—— (1994b) 'Where did the Narrator Go? Towards a Grammar of Translation', *The Slavic and East European Journal*: 38, Issue 1.
McHale, B. (1987) *Postmodernist Fiction*, London and New York: Methuen
Mestrovic, M. (1992) 'Tatyana Tolstaya', *Publishers Weekly*, 1 January 1992: 37/38.
Moser, C. (1988) 'The Achievement of Constance Garnett', *American Scholar*, Summer: 431-38.

Nabokov, V. (1955) 'Problems of Translation: *Onegin* in English', *Partisan Review* 22: 496-512.
—— (1963) *Invitation to a Beheading*, trans. D. Nabokov, London: Penguin.
—— (1982) 'The Art of Translation' in F. Bowers (ed.) *Lessons in Russian Literature*: London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
Newmark, P. (1981) *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford: OUP.
Nida, E.A. (1964) *Towards a Science of Translating, With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
—— (1965) *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Nord, C. (1997) 'A Functional Topology of Translations' in A. Trosborg (ed.) *Text, Typolgy and Translation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 43-65.
Offord, D. (1996) *Using Russian: A Guide to Contemporary Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Oinas, (1984) *Essays on Russian Folklore and Mythology*, Columbus: Slavica.
Olohan, M. (2004) *Introducing corpora in translation studies*, London: Routledge.
Olohan, M. and M. Baker (2000) 'Reporting *that* in translated English: Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation?' *Across Languages and Cultures* 1: 141-72.
Olshanskaya, N. (2000) 'Anti-Utopian Carnival: Vladimir Voinovich Rewriting George Orwell', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, XXXVI: 426-437
Pala, C. (1994) 'Russian emigrants tread water off Japanese bay' in *Insight on the News* 12 December 1994.
Primavesi, P. (1999) 'The Performance of Translation: Benjamin and Brecht on the Loss of Small Details' *TDR (1988-)* 43, 4: 53-59.
Propp, V. (1969) Morphology of the Fairytale, trans. L. Scott, Austin: University of Texas Press.
Pushkin, A. (1881) *Eugene Onegin*, trans. H. Spalding, London: Macmillan.
—— (1964) *Eugene Onegin* (with commentary), trans. V. Nabokov, New York: Bollingen.
Pym, A. (2000a) 'Translating Linguistic Variation: Parody and the Creation of Authenticity' in M.A. Vega & R. Martin-Gaitero (eds) *Traduccion, metropoli y diaspora*, Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Online: <http://www.tinet.org/~apym/on-line/authenticity.html> (accessed 17 January 2007).
—— (2000b) 'Historical Development: Late Victorian to the Present' in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 73-81.
Ralston, W. (1873) (ed.) *Russian Folk Tales*, London: Smith, Elder.
Ransome, A. (1916) *Old Peter's Russian Tales*, London: T.C. & E.C. Jack.
—— (1976) *Autobiography* ed. R. Hart-Davis, London: Jonathan Cape.
Rich, E. (1995) 'Interview: Tatyana Tolstaya', *South Central Review, Special Issue: Russian Literature after Perestroika*, Fall/Winter: 84-91
Robinson, D. (2000) 'The limits of translation' in P. France (ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 15-20.
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (2002) 'Developments in the Russian Language in the Post-Soviet Period', *The Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 18, 1: 117-138.
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. and T. Wade (1999) *The Russian Language Today*, London: Routledge.
Shneidman, N. (1995) *Russian Literature 1988-1994*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
—— (2004) *Russian Literature 1995-2002: On the Threshold of the New Millenium*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press
Scheunemann, D. (ed.) (1996) *Orality, literacy and modern media*, Columbia: Camden House.
Schleiermacher, F. (1995) 'On the Different Methods of Translation', trans. M. Snell-Hornby in M. Snell-Hornby *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Scott, M. (1997) *WordSmith Tools version 4.0*, Oxford: OUP.

Shklovsky, V. (1988) 'Art as Technique' in D. Lodge (ed.) *Modern Criticism and Theory*, London and New York: Longman.
Smith, A. (1997) 'In Populist Clothes: Anarchy and Subversion in Petrushevskaya's Latest Fiction', *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, pp. 107-125.
—— (1999) 'Carnivalising the Canon: The Grotesque and the Subversive in Contemporary Russian Women's Prose (Petrushevskaia, Sadur, Tolstaia, Narbikova)' in I. Lilly and H. Mondry (eds.) *Russian Literature in Transition*, Nottingham: Astra Press.
—— (2001) *The Postmodernist Image of Moscow in the Prose of Petrushevskaya and Pelevin*, Personal communication: 07.06.01.
—— (2004) Extract from lecture delivered at University of Princeton 24 March. Personal communication.
Sorych, U. (2004) 'Mutierte Sprache: Elemente des prostoreèie in Kys'', *Hausarbeiten* K26304. Online: <http://www.hausarbeiten.de/faecher/hausarbeit/rus/26304.html> (accessed 17 January 2007).
Stalin, J. (1946) *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
Stewart, D. (2000) 'Poor relations and black sheep in translation studies', *Target* 12: 205-28
Stites, R. (1992) *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society since 1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
TEI (Text Encoding Initiative). Online. <http://www.tei-c.org/ > (accessed 17 January 2007)
Tarras, V. (1985) (ed.) *Handbook of Russian Literature*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Tolstoy, L. (1875-77) *Anna Karenina*, trans. N. Dole, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.
—— (1934) *Ivan Ilych and Hadji Murad*, trans. L. and A. Maude, London: Humphrey Milford.
Uhler, W. (2003) 'Sharp Pen Dissects Foibles of Post-Soviet Russia' in *San Francisco Chronicle*, 12 January 2003.
Vandaele, J. (2002) '(Re-)Constructing Humour: Meanings and Means', *The Translator* 8: 149-172.
Vasilyeva, A. (1972) *Particles in Colloquial Russian*, trans. V. Korotky and K. Villiers, Moscow: Progress.
Veisbergs, A. (1997) 'The Contextual Use of Idiom, Wordplay, and Translation' in D. Delabatista (ed.) *Traductio, Essays on Punning and Translation*, Manchester: St Jerome.
Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*, London and New York: Routledge
Vermeer, H. J. (2000). Skopos and commission in translational action, trans. A. Chesterman, in L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge (pp. 221-32).
Zamyatin, Y. (1972) *We*, trans. M. Ginsburg, New York: Viking.

Dictionaries

Dal', V. (2002) *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка*, Moscow: Русский язык.
Kveselevich, D. (2005) *Толковый словарь ненормативной лексики русского языка*, Moscow: Астрель·АСТ.
Ozhegov, S. (1978) *Словарь русского языка*, Moscow: Русский язык.
Shliakhov, V. and E. Adler (1999) *Dictionary of Russian Slang and Colloquial Expressions*, New York: Barron's.
Ushakov, D. (1935) *Толковый словарь русского языка*, Moscow: Советская энциклопедия.
Crowe, B. (1969) *Concise Dictionary of Soviet Terminology, Institutions and Abbreviations*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Pearsall, J. & Patrick Hanks (eds) (1999), The New Oxford Dictionary of English, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

* * *

The Holy Bible (King James Edition), (1876), Glasgow: William Collins, Sons & Company.